

the lake. But after all, people from Anish Kapoor to Frank Gehry and others made an interpretation of what they found, with the right intuition and design intelligence. They gave form to that, and it can lead to the success of the place itself. If the wonderful Anish Kapoor piece, which reflects the people, had not been there, but instead, say, a Richard Serra piece, the park would not have been so successful.

KRIEGER: One of its charms is that it's eclectic. There's also that strange neoclassical exedra that people photograph. And there's the inevitable ice skating rink and restaurant. So there are both populism and acts of great creativity.

GOLDBERGER: Some portions, like the cast stone balustrades, are far more retrograde and inferior to anything at Bryant Park, lest we posit Millennium Park as radical design and Battery Park as only reaction and conservatism.

CRAWFORD: Alex draws attention to the important public conversation about urbanism that is particularly active in Chicago—public participation is a huge factor in how these things work and are accepted. It isn't simply the public place, but the public conversation—a term of Robert Fishman's. In New York it's also very loud and active.

GOLDBERGER: Much more so than before.

CRAWFORD: 9/11 turned up the volume of the public conversation. In these conversations, urbanistic proposals are very useful in their physicality and materiality, showing a vision or establishing a clear position about what a city can be.

PIEPZ: You can think of urban design as something that doesn't have to be built but that puts forward different visions that allow debate about strategy and priorities, so decisions can be made and issues seen before you spend \$10 billion, and so you can meet the public who care about what gets done.

CZERNIAK: That's why competitions have been so successful—they help set up the debate by presenting many visions simultaneously.