



VINCENT SCULLY PRIZE AWARD CEREMONY

Witold Rybczynski
Awarded on January 17, 2007

Official Transcript

WITOLD RYBCZNYSKI: I don't think I can adequately thank the people who introduced me, and I think both Jack and Moshe know how important it was to me that they are here, and what they said was just icing on the cake, so thank you both. As Jack said, being in this company is a little daunting and certainly a part of the honor. But for me personally, I think receiving the prize that is named in honor of Professor Scully was at least as important; like everybody in my generation, even in the far north of Canada, I was influenced by Vincent Scully's work. His writing of course, his criticism, his talent scouting—a great talent scout he was, is.

But one of the things that struck me the most—because many people wrote architectural criticism, and not many were as good at picking talent as he was—but he managed to situate buildings always in a bigger context, whether it was the landscape or, particularly, the city. He wrote eloquently about architecture as architecture, but it was never isolated. It was always part of a place, and he ended up telling us, me, about this place, and as I said, particularly the city and what architecture meant to the city. And what this bigger place meant to architecture. And so I thought, when I was asked to speak tonight, to pay for my supper I suppose, that I thought I should really talk about urbanism, because that would be the right thing to do, rather than bathrooms, which I have recently written on Slate about.

So this talk is going to be about urbanism, and it is supposed to be an original talk, which it is, and I thought it should be a big theme, and so it's really about the shape of our cities and the urban design ideas that have shaped our cities. And in the second part of the talk, the unusual way I think in which ideas about cities have come to pass, and particularly American cities.

I want to start by talking about four paradigms that I think are important in the 20th century, and they are not *the* four paradigms—there is a number 5 and 6—and four seemed to be a reasonable number to fit into 45 minutes. But I do think there are arguably the more important ones, and they are connected, which is important. And as I said, there are other paradigms that I'm sure you can think of. But all of these have important in influencing the way we think about cities.

The first one starts at the beginning of the century. And the garden city was the idea of an Englishman, but it's really an American idea. Ebenezer Howard immigrated to the United States. He was unsuccessful. On the way back, he stopped in Chicago for about year, and he lifted two things from Chicago. The motto of Chicago, of course, is *urbs in hortis*, or “the garden city.” So the name of his book—and, later, the

great international movement that he founded—really comes directly from the United States, from Chicago. But more importantly, Chicago was the site of Riverside, which was the first great planned suburb that Frederick Law Olmsted and Albert Fox had built. Many years earlier, Howard was in Chicago about the turn of the century, but that was just as well, because like most pioneering real estate ventures, Riverside basically failed for the first 40 years; not because it was a bad idea, but mainly because Chicago burned down, and all the money and activity went to the center of the city, and the idea of building a suburb and investing in 10 miles away from the city was really not high on people's agenda.

By 1900, the trees—the thousands of trees that had been planted at Riverside—were mature, and the community was very successful. And this had a great impact on Howard. I don't have a slide of Riverside, but I have one of Sudgrove Park which is another planned community that Olmsted built some time later. And this vision of a city that was green, that was really different from the way people lived in North American cities—or, for that matter, European cities—I think had a great impact on Howard when he wrote his book and started something which is hard, I think, for us to understand in terms of scale and impact. It is probably only the environmental movement of the late 20th century that comes close. It was international. It was not an architectural movement, it was a political movement. It brought in hundreds of thousands of people around the world. It had an enormous impact.

Howard's idea, of course, was to build satellite cities which would be self-sustaining and self-supporting in the countryside. That never really worked. There was one or two cities built. But the great accomplishment was Hampstead Garden suburb, which anticipates Bob Stern's subway suburb because it really was a subway suburb. The English metro lines had been built out to Hampstead Heath, and that was how people got from Hampstead to their jobs in the city, and Hampstead Garden suburb was the realization of this idea that Olmsted had started 40 years before, but really fully developed into a development with many different uses, many different kinds of housing. With very sophisticated planning. And with very good architects contributing—in this case, Edwin Logeans designing the housing around the green and also the two churches that stand in Hampstead.

Frederick Law Olmsted Jr., the son of Olmsted, was actually in Europe visiting the garden suburbs when he was offered the job to design and plan Forest Hill Gardens, which was an American version of garden city suburb, of the garden suburb, in Queens. It's still there. It's still successful. It's much denser than what the Europeans were doing. There is more automobile ownership, it's a railroad suburb. Where it says station square is where the railroad station was. There was density there. There were retail and apartment buildings, and then a slow kind of reduction of density into the, as you descended into the community it became much greener.

Oddly enough, this kind of Germanic Tudor architecture, which is very romantic and also one of the very first examples of a major large-scale successful precast concrete housing project. So under all this Germanic froufrou is actually highly industrialized precast concrete building system, showing on the one hand how advanced it was and how the aesthetics of what you do and what you do isn't necessarily connected in the obvious way that we might suspect.

The garden city idea was very powerful in American urbanism, and the garden suburbs really spread at

this time in many communities. This is an example in Wilmington, designed by John Noland. I've got him listed here as an architect, but he was really a landscape architect. I think one of the reasons for the success of these garden suburbs was they were planned by landscape architects and not by architects, let alone city planners. So the landscape becomes an important part, and you've got this great green swath that goes through the community. A very modest community that was built during the First World War for shipyard workers in Delaware, and still a success despite the very small size of the houses, still a successful community and a really beautiful plan.

Another one of these Yorkshire Village in Camden, a more sort of formal plan with a square in the middle. It's surrounded by shops. That large building south of the square was the school, and the street car runs along the main street and takes workers to the shipyard plants further up the Delaware.

The emphasis in these garden suburbs was always on the garden part. The landscaping was important, how the streets were treated was important, and the housing tends to be rather background. You can see a kind of neo-colonial in this case, sometimes more, sometimes less. These were very modest houses, so the amount of historical detail was very minimal.

One of the last great garden suburbs built just before the Depression was by Olmsted Jr., Palos Verdes Estates in Los Angeles, which was built on this beautiful peninsula—and, again, a landscape architect functioned as a planner here. And he built the first one of these garden suburbs that was specifically planned for the automobile. It started out actually as a street car suburb, but by the time it got going they realized that car ownership—which was the highest in California anywhere in the world at that point—that the car was really going to be the way people got around. And so they created on this beautiful landscape a very sensitive plan that really integrates in the landscape but also explores the fact that people could spread themselves out. So you have not so much a low density but high density in pockets and lots of green spaces, golf courses, country clubs, which is what you see in this picture here.

This paradigm really was very important right up until the Depression, so for 30 years the garden suburb was something that was probably the strongest influence in terms of American urbanism and urban design.

The second paradigm is the *Ville Radieuse*, Le Corbusier's notion of how the city could be remade. The important thing to understand about the garden suburb and Raymond Unwin—who I didn't talk very much about, but he is really the leading designer in England of the garden suburb movement—was that it was evolutionary. If you read Unwin, he sees the garden suburb as part of an evolution that goes all the way back to medieval cities. He doesn't see it as different from urbanism. His great book on urbanism really sees all of this as a continuity, a continuum of designs, and so he isn't reacting against anything; he's really adding on to it and extending, in his mind, a tradition.

Le Corbusier really took a different approach. His approach was revolution. And I think that was his most important influence. It wasn't necessarily the formal elements of his ideas, but it was the idea that you could, and indeed should, wipe the slate clean and think things through from zero. Everything will be new, he said in one of his books. and that had an enormous influence, because it's very attractive. I mean,

all architects start with a clean slate because we have a white piece of paper on our board. And so the idea that you could really dream up anything and that there's more different from the past is better. I think there is something that engaged architects for a long time after that, long after Corbusier's direct formal influence really declined.

The *Ville Radieuse* was a theoretical plan of the city. It started with a plan for Paris as more of a kind of PR gesture: Demolishing half of Paris and replacing it. This was, then, the theoretical city of a very tall buildings and essentially everything that the traditional city had this didn't have. So it didn't have streets, it didn't have sidewalks, it had very tall buildings rather than low buildings. It had a separation of functions rather than a mixture of functions. So it was very much a reactive, reactionary idea, I think. But as I said, it was more the notion of "we could really start afresh" that was attractive to people. The notion that we lived in a different age. It's always attractive to think that we are better, different than your parents and your grandparents, and I think that was one of the messages that Corbusier really instilled in the architectural and planning professions.

The results of this in America were not great, as we know, and much has been written about this. Robert Taylor Homes was one of the biggest housing projects in the world. What surprised me was that the architects were Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. This doesn't show up in their centenary books. It was very much a rethinking of how you would build a city. Of these great tall buildings. 25,000 residents a real city but living in 28 towers in a 2-mile-long strip. It wasn't lack of talent, and as this famous photograph of Pruitt-Igoe and the less famous but kind of impressive photograph on the bottom of what it actually looked like. It was even sort of more impressive in some ways than Robert Taylor Homes.

This was in some way heralded as the end of modernism. We know, of course, that it wasn't the end of modernism, but it's the end of one sort of stage. It was the end of modernism as a kind of social agenda. But I think modernism as a style and as an aesthetic consideration rebounded very strongly some years later.

It's also worth remembering that Corbusier's ideas were not a failure everywhere. It's easy to sort of say, "Well, these housing projects were so awful. Clearly he was a nutcase." In many countries, Corbusier's ideas took hold in a much more positive way. Brasilia, you could argue, is sort of good and bad things about it, but certainly it wasn't a failure in any sense in the way that housing projects in America were. And particularly in Asia, the whole notion of living in high density and tall buildings, of getting out of the ground and creating a vertical city, was implemented very successfully. So I think we need to give him his due here and admit that it wasn't—it's too simplistic to simply call it a misguided idea. I think it certainly didn't take hold in America in any successful way, although as I'll show you, that is debatable.

It's easy to forget this paradigm, because Frank Lloyd Wright was such a great architect, and at the time this idea of Broadacre City seemed so eccentric that it was kind of pushed under the table. Many historians, admirers of Wright, which almost everybody is, have sort of suggested that really this was a kind of make-work project instituted to keep his office busy. But I think that's really unfair and untrue. Frank Lloyd Wright started in the '30s thinking about Broadacre City, and for the rest of his life there were several books, a number of projects, and really it turned over and over. Even when he was very busy

as an architect, this idea was something that really stayed with him. And the idea starts in some ways with Le Corbusier, who was invited by the *New York Times Magazine* to write an article about American cities. He, of course, had never been to America at this point, but that didn't stop him, and he indicted our cities. He said Central Park was this horrible kind of vacuum in the city, it should be filled up with buildings, and our buildings were too short. He was very critical. But his idea was essentially his message: the city should go up; it should be very different; it should be entirely new and vertical.

And this enraged Frank Lloyd Wright, who was enraged about Le Corbusier anyway for taste reasons, but also, intellectually I think Wright understood that Corbusier was completely wrong about what Americans needed in their cities. And several months later he wrote a kind of rebuttal in the *New York Times* in 1932 where the phrase "Broadacre City" actually appeared for the first time, although this is not a really a description of a city. It's really an attack on Corbusier in saying, "Why do we need to go up? We have all this space, really, we should do the opposite: we should spread out. We should take advantage of the fact that we have this huge country and we have automobiles. And that we don't need to be in vertical buildings." Despite that—and as everybody knows, if you write for the media, they always shoot you in the foot—the editors show one of Frank Lloyd Wright's vertical buildings to illustrate the article. But never mind, that was not what the article was about.

One should remember Frank Lloyd Wright in many ways could be described as a suburban architect, almost a rural man, in the sense that he lived in Madison. He lived on his beautiful estates that he created in the countryside. But there was a moment in the '30s when he lived in the city. And the city he chose to live in was Los Angeles. He spent some time in Japan, abroad and when he returned to America, he decided to settle down in L.A., mainly because he thought this was a new place. He was looking for clients, as architects always are, and he thought this would be a place where this kind of approach would be appreciated, and his new ideas might take root. He was right, he was probably early. But as we know, California—indeed, Southern California—did become a place where new architectural ideas were accepted much more quickly than in the rest of the country.

But he was also very influenced by LA. He was influenced by the fact that here was a city that was not like any other city. It was about 60 miles long, and everybody had cars, and as I said, car ownership was higher in L.A. than anywhere else in the world, and all of these things influenced him, and as I said Wright is a very—he has always been shown as kind of an emotional romantic, but he was also very tough minded, and his analysis of America was: this was the future. Of course, he was right. And he often says about this urbanism, "This is not something I thought up. This is something that is happening. I'm just trying to steer it." And so L.A. has this enormous influence on his ideas of the city, and after he wrote this *Times* piece he wrote a book about urbanism, which was equally vague. It wasn't the plan, like Corbusier. I think he felt he really ought to get this down, and in the early '30s Edgar Kaufman—and this is the beginning of the Depression, there's not much happening in Wright's office—Edgar Kaufman says, "Look, you have been talking a lot about this. I'll bankroll a study. Why don't you actually show us. People will be interested. You're not doing anything else in the office." And that's how the actual plan of Broadacre City happened. And this is one of the early sketches that Wright made, showing sort of residences and farms, and here is a wonderful photograph of the city next to this huge model.

There are two things about Broadacre City I think that are important. One of them is obvious, and I think one of them is less obvious. The obvious thing is: there is no center. Everything is all over the place: there is the county seat, there is a stadium, there is a huge church. There's houses on different-sized lots, there's shopping centers, you'd call them the roadside markets, but they are essentially malls. They even have glass roofs to protect the circulation areas. But it's all scattered all over the landscape, so there is no center in the traditional sense, and that was of course very striking. And that was part of his notion, that this decentralization was really you didn't need centers any more.

But the other thing about it that's less obvious, but I think in some ways both scary and dramatic, is: it has no edges. This is not the plan of a city, this is the plan of as much of the city as you can fit on an 8-foot-square model. It just goes on. He simply cuts his city, and there is no sense that this is a city with this many people and that you would build one here and one here. This is really a piece of a carpet that presumably stops at the Pacific, or maybe at the Rocky Mountains or a big river. But there is no sense in Broadacre City that there is a limit to it. It's simply something that keeps going.

Here is a more-specific plan where you can see these various functions, and the way they kind of scatter around and don't really create any center, intentionally. There is a big highway, those lines on one side are highways. It was a mixture of science fiction, and he had everybody in helicopters, which did not of course happen. He had basically one-acre lots, small agriculture—which also didn't happen. So there are a number of things in Broadacre City that are far-fetched, and there are also a number of things that we can recognize: the megachurch, the sprawling of the city over in a relatively low density, the mixture of things, the way retail is hugging the road rather than creating towns. Here's one of his drawings showing this kind of landscape which is both city and country or both the city and the country or the country and the city. It's all mixed up together in a way that was very unusual, and of course it was ridiculed and really didn't have any huge impact at the time. Wright did design some subdivisions that were sort of as close as he got. He never, of course, built anything like Broadacre City. Sonya Homes in Pleasantville is about the largest subdivision that he ever built. But he did, in a sense, build Broadacre, because that big model he had at Taliesin, he would add to it. He designed a building, and then it would show up on the model, and people always kind of made fun of that because it sounds like he just kind of opportunistically was shoving stuff in.

But I don't think that's true. I think what it is, is that every architect when they design a building has to have a city in their mind, whether it's Manhattan or whether it's countryside or whatever it is, and the city in Wright's mind was Broadacre City, and every building, if you go and look at Beth Shalom in Philadelphia, marvelous building, it makes no sense in the middle of the suburbs. Little dinky houses around it. It's not a suburban building, it's a Broadacre City building. It's supposed to be on a mountaintop somewhere. Not rural, but part of this image of the city that he had.

And then it makes sense, because it's like one of these big megachurches that he shows in the model. It's his building of Broadacre City, and of course every Usonian house is a Broadacre City in miniature, in a sense. So he wasn't able to build a city, but he was able to build bits of it, and I think Marin County Government Center is another example. And so the whole second part of his career, sort of post-Depression is very much part of that. I should give credit to David DeLong, who has written about this,

and his ideas I am really stealing here.

And the fourth paradigm, and we have heard her mentioned: you really can't talk about urbanism without talking about Jane Jacobs and in many ways her paradigm is a refutation of the previous three. Not so much Wright, because she wasn't really interested in suburbs—in my opinion a great failing, because the country was becoming suburban, and if you read *Death and Life of American Cities*, you wouldn't know that. You would assume that Americans all live in big cities, which was already not the case and quickly would be demographically not the case.

It's also curious that Jane Jacobs is so popular with architects, because in some ways she was attacking the whole notion of design. She was saying, "We have cities, and they work, and we don't need to rebuild them, we don't need to remake them. We just need to take care of them. But what we have is very good. And what we have is really not designable." That, at least, is my interpretation of many of the things she says. But she certainly played this role of bringing our attention back to the real city, the existing city, and what in a sense some of the earlier paradigms had wanted to really unmake or undo.

Some of those qualities are mixed-use, the diversity of cities in terms of architects as well as people. It's the importance of streets rather than having plazas and pedestrian malls and all the ideas that really grew out of the *Ville Radieuse*. Not so much Corbusian ideas, but all failed ideas of the '60s and '70s. They really wanted to remake the city, and she is saying, "No, it works. The streets work, sidewalks work. And above all, age." I think that's a big theme of *Death and Life of American Cities*, is that you need old buildings and new buildings. You need a lot of variety, and that age itself is a quality of cities and in a sense it becomes impossible to design a new city because it is all one age. What you really need is that whole gradient of old and new, and it creates places for bohemians and places for rich people and so on.

I need to make a confession in the interest of full disclosure at this point. I teach at Penn in the School of Design but since I came there I also teach of course and have an appointment at the Wharton School in the real estate department, and I found it very interesting and stimulating to teach there because I had always taught architects and sort of hung out mostly with architects, and economists and students in business were a very different. And what was surprising at first was that they were no less interested in the city. Most of my colleagues in the real estate department really have no interest in real estate development. They are really committed to urbanism, and they are studying cities, and they really have very much the same attitude in many ways that my colleagues in architecture and city planning have.

The big difference was the way they went about it. Architects and planners pretty much jump from an interest in the city to knowing how we all should live, and they don't necessarily look very much at the city, it seems to me, and try to understand it, but they know what the city should be, they know what's good for us. The economists were really much more interested in understanding why people did what they did. Why did they move to this city rather than that city? What was it that drove them? And so it was more a point of view that I found different, not so much talking about what should be the future, but understanding what is taking place in the present. That, of course, makes them much more valuable in terms of society. If you can understand what's going on, A, you can make a lot of money and B, you know you are better placed in making decisions about whatever it is you are doing.

So I think what I am now going to talk about is a sort of hypothesis based on this experience. Not about visions of the future, but really trying to understand how these paradigms have affected the shape of our cities. And in some ways, you could think of paradigms as the supply side of the equation. It's the architect or the planner, you know, putting something on the table and saying, "What about this? Isn't this a great idea?" Of course, they're not that humble when they put it on the table. They say this is the future. Essentially they are volunteering very important ideas, because without those volunteered ideas we wouldn't progress; demand does not produce ideas, demand is just demand. A friend of mine, an old classmate, I came across this quote of his: "In the long run it's demand-side pressures that forge the shape of cities." And for me, it was like a light going off, cause of course you can put ideas on the table, but if people don't like them, the ideas die, and in a democracy that is a capitalist, free-market system, what people want is awfully important. You may think that a pedestrian mall is a great idea. But if people don't want it, store keepers don't like it, and people don't want to sit in plazas, then it goes nowhere, which is basically what happened to pedestrian malls. We built hundreds. There are I think 30 or 40 left, mostly in college towns because college students have more time to sit around in shopping malls, in pedestrian malls, whereas people driving home from work don't want to go through that whole complexity of where do you park, and they don't have time to sit around anyway.

So it seemed to me that we had on the one hand the paradigms I described were being offered to the market, to people and on the other hand, people were responding. And the interesting thing about the response is not simply yes or no but rather that what the market does is says, "Yes, I like this, but I don't like it this way, I like it another way. I like it upside down. I love it upside down. I just don't like it the way you present it. I like this half of it and not that half of it." And the market then takes these ideas and kind of grinds them up. Some of them it just rejects outright and the idea of putting poor people in concentrated tall buildings was really rejected by those people almost immediately. That's why those buildings got destroyed so quickly.

Other ideas get changed. And if we look at these four paradigms, the garden suburb has its run until the 1930s, but then it returns in the '60s and '70s and as themed communities. I'm just making fun of New Urbanism here, Jack, but we can say as New Urbanism. And the market loves New Urbanism. It loves the idea of a theme. It loves the idea that you have a community, and there's something tying it together. It's not just kind of an accident. It has sort of a visual theme. In a way, it's the success of design. It turns out Americans do like design, but it's not what we expected. It's not sort of Scandinavian furniture and low houses with lots of glass. It turns out to be a different kind of design, but it is design, and it is important. And so you have Seaside which really starts this whole thing and you all know about that.

It's not that it's such a great idea. The important thing, I think, is the public reaction to it, it's that it fits the way we live, and it fits the way developers develop, things and it's a way of making money, because density makes more money than low density. Nobody likes sprawl on the business side. It costs a lot of money, and the reasons for sprawl are more complicated than simply developers want to spread us out. They'd much rather do this kind of thing; it's much less expensive, and you have higher profits with higher density.

There is, of course, Jack and Bob Stern's project Celebration, which is probably one of the best implemented of these large projects. But the sort of return of the garden suburb in this different guise, in some ways is unexpected. It's not what we think would happen, but I think—this taking of the notion of the theme—has become really a significant success.

We can now see, Celebration is old enough that it's sort of grown in, and we can see the attraction of these. After all, rich Americans have sort of cornered these neighborhoods. You can't actually afford to live in Charleston any more, but you can afford to live in many of these communities.

Ville Radieuse, as I said, was successful in other countries, and I think what we can see, particularly in the last decade or so, this great success of high-rise urban living. And both in terms of high designed buildings but also in sort of more pedestrian buildings. It's also worth reminding—as we were recently, since this project just changed hands—that not all of these Corbusian projects were failures, even at this level. And so you've got something like Stuyvesant Town, which suddenly, there's going to be plaques put on it and everybody is so upset. Because they are sold and they loved living there. And it's I think interesting that here you have this *Ville Radieuse* that turns out to have been pretty successful at a sort of pretty affordable level. But more to the point, in recent years we have got this great movement back into cities and high-rise buildings in urban locations. Especially if it's near the water. Corbusier never understood that because European cities don't have these big bodies of water, but in a way it's kind of a vindication of Corbusier's idea, because his notion was you could live in a tower surrounded by green. Turns out that's not so great, because people are hiding behind the trees. But if you are surrounded or at least have a lot of water on one side, water isn't so threatening. People aren't going to come from out of the water. And yet you have the same experience as the *Ville Radieuse*. You have expanse, natural expanse in front of you, great views, and so in a funny way it is Corbusier's idea come back in a kind of a different guise. But not totally different—that's Calatrava's building, which probably won't get built. But it might be. I don't know. It sort of seems to be in limbo at the moment.

And, of course, Chicago is kind of the *Ville Radieuse* pushed up against the lake. Enormously successful. Just as a footnote, you see the beautiful John Hancock tower, and those little guys at the bottom are the Mies van der Rohe buildings from the 1950s, and then we see how the scale really has changed over the years.

So the *Ville Radieuse* does come back; it's not a total failure. It fails dramatically in certain ways, but it also succeeds, and this downtown vertical living is very much a success of that paradigm—and, of course, at the relatively high end.

It's pretty obvious that with Broadacre City, contrary to all the criticisms, Wright was right. And he understood what was coming. It wasn't as designed as he would have wanted, it wasn't as thought through as he wanted and expected, but certainly his notion of the decentralized city, of all these paradigms, is probably the one that characterizes American urbanism the most. Here is a picture of Levittown. There is a direct connection. I was researching a book that I just finished writing. Alfred Levitt was the designer brother of the Levitt brothers; William was the technology guy who got it all produced. But Alfred designed both the layouts of the communities and also designed the houses. He took a leave of

absence, and he spent the summer following a Frank Lloyd Wright Usonian house being built on Long Island, and if you look at the earlier Levittown houses, they are basically simplified Usonians. They don't have basements; they have slab heating; they have these open living dining rooms; they have long, low lines of, basically, ranchers, which are very similar to what Wright was doing. And so there was a direct movement from Wright to people like Alfred Levitt, and particularly in Levittown, the whole layout of the community was very much influenced, I think, by Broadacre ideas. It's got these sort of rough neighborhoods, but they're really like districts of housing, and there is something in the middle, but the something is always different—so it's a school in one area, there's a community center, and there's a swimming pool. There is a kind of decentralization of community functions. All the retail is pushed out in a kind of strip on the main highway. And so it clearly is directly influenced and indirectly influenced, because his residence also had automobiles, and so he was able to build this quite far out in the country. Most of these people were steel workers. Levittown would work in a big, new steel plant.

And, of course, the suburban development was influenced by Broadacre. But even more in the last few years, this whole movement towards exurban development is a more even literal kind of translation of Broadacre, where the developer comes right up against agricultural land, as it does in Broadacre City. You have farms and houses and farms and shopping malls. And something that is becoming increasingly familiar, so again the paradigm gets taken by what people actually want, which is: you have the country but also you live close to it.

And the final paradigm of Jane Jacobs. She obviously had a great influence on planners and architects, but I think also in a broader sense through them and then through her writings which are read by many people on ideas of cities, and the problem I think with her idea—or the way it got taken up by what people really wanted—was that there weren't that many Greenwich Villages around. Greenwich Village was great, and everybody recognized that, but Kansas City wasn't Greenwich Village, and so what happened was the small number of places that were like Greenwich Village, the Bostons, the San Franciscos, really became the focus of—people said, “Yeah, these are great things.” Then they looked around and there aren't that many places like this, and the places that were like this was what economists called glamour cities or super cities. But they are the cities which sort of attracted people, beginning of course with Greenwich Village itself and then various areas of Manhattan that were sort of like Greenwich Village, and that became extremely expensive. Which, of course, was not part of her paradigm at all. This was supposed to be mixed communities, the kind of bohemian mixture that she knew as a resident of Greenwich Village. But, indeed, they became sort of luxury enclaves, and so you have SoHo, in New York City, becoming one of these enclaves. Or San Francisco itself. So you have entire cities which are highly specialized, where the real estate values are enormously high, partly because so many people want to live there, and partly because people who do live there are the wealthiest people, so they can actually afford those high real estate values. And that was a quite unexpected result of her opening our eyes up to diversity and the attraction of certain beautiful old cities. But, in a sense, perhaps to be expected.

I was never privileged to be a student of Vincent Scully, but I did hear him lecture several times because he made a long trek up to Montreal, and I was thinking of how to close this lecture here tonight. And I remember that this most wonderful closing of a lecture he gave about Venetian architecture—and I don't

know if you will recall this, but you ended your lecture by singing the gondolier song from some opera.

That has stuck with me forever. And you were in full voice. It was a wonderful kind of way to wrap up your talk on Venice and the architecture of Venice, and I can't sing, not having any Irish genes at all in me. So I'm not going to sing, but I thought I would end with a song or the lyric of a song because perhaps what I'm saying sounds kind of nihilistic and economics after all the dismal science, so perhaps I have been affected by the dismalness of my colleagues at the Wharton school. So I didn't want to leave you with the sense that somehow the designer's work is sort of an impossible challenge, because I think the designer has to put things on the table. Demand doesn't produce anything. I mean, we didn't know we needed iPods until we got them, now we love them, but we weren't there saying, we want iPods. It doesn't work that way. And so I think the same thing happens with our cities. It's not that we don't know or we didn't know that we wanted to look at the waterfronts. We didn't know that we wanted to live in tall buildings with these views. We didn't know that we would rediscover old architecture and all these things happen because architects and designers and activists saved the buildings and sort of opened our eyes to these things.

So I wanted to end with a quote from one of the great philosophers of my generation: "You can't always get what you want, but if you try sometimes, you just might find, you get what you need." Thank you very much.