

lis, where difference is visible; and Sorkin is conflating the two, imagining that somehow a diverse public equals a public of democratic interaction. They're quite different, although they are not mutually exclusive. And now we have electronic media that allow you to be in several places at once. Things are changing—there's a complex rearticulation of public and private.

**GOLDBERGER:** I agree. I don't accept Sorkin's negativity about public realm as a place for pleasure and his belief that it used to be a place for noble civic engagement, when in fact, even long ago, the small town with the little square and band shell was as much a piece of the public realm as anything in Hyde Park or Union Square.

**SAUNDERS:** I think it's unfair to Sorkin to imply that he looks down on pleasure. After all, "sixties people" revel in sensual excess. Focusing more on consumerism and "lifestyle" would be a better way of spinning what he's saying. Then, too, pleasure comes in many forms, some of which you would find revolting or hollow.

**CRAWFORD:** There's a kind of upper-middle-class bias against consumers by the very people who shop at The Gap.

**GOLDBERGER:** The Gap was the very first thing to initiate the transformation of Times Square in the 1990s. Then Disney came. These jump-started the whole new stage.

**CRAWFORD:** In Central Square, The Gap is a social condenser that mixes publics under the sign of consumption.

**SAUNDERS:** I'll just say that if I'm in a city and my only option is to shop and not go to museums or anything like that, I want to go home.

**MOUSSAVI:** The Tate Modern sells more per second than the Selfridges department store in London. And it's getting an extension where there will be a lot of retail. So, I don't think that you can differentiate museums and retail so much anymore. Your approach to urban design is too idealistic. At least in Europe the public sector can no longer pay for urban design.

**KRIEGER:** That's just as true here, maybe more.