

similar. I'm also trying to connect that to the point that other forces may in the end be more decisive.

KRIEGER: But it seems that adjacency—not to be confused with contextualism—is a very important urban design or urbanistic methodology. At Bryant Park, the edge was there, but it was not profiting as much as it could have because of the void.

GOLDBERGER: Precisely.

KRIEGER: So, the replacement of the void helped the edge, and the edge of course helped the void. And it's the same with Chicago too. So that's one thing an urban design-minded individual is adept at—trying to take advantage of and even reenergize adjacencies.

GOLDBERGER: Right. Indeed, urban design is in part about acknowledging connections, whereas architecture historically has not required that one be cognizant of connections, although one of the reasons the relationship between the disciplines is problematic right now is that architects have in part adopted many of the strategies of urban design.

CZERNIAK: And landscape.

GOLDBERGER: And landscape architecture, but they have been far more cognizant of connections than in the days of Sert.

SAUNDERS: I wonder if, in your comments about Bryant Park, you are very close to saying, "It wouldn't much matter whether it was Laurie Olin or Lawrence Halprin or Martha Schwartz that designed it." In other words, in urban design the details are insignificant.

GOLDBERGER: No, if I believed that, I should be in another line of work. However, I do mean to offer a cautionary word and not indulge in physical determinism.

SAUNDERS: But, in all this discussion, I hope we can specify what it is that works in the design of any place you consider admirable, say Bryant Park.