



VINCENT SCULLY PRIZE AWARD CEREMONY

Jane Jacobs

Awarded on November 11, 2000

Official Transcript

JANE JACOBS: I don't know how I will ever live up to this. You are all so kind and., well, I'm overwhelmed. Let me see, I have a speech here.

Well, we take it for granted that some things improve or are enhanced with the passage of time and the changes that passage of time brings. Trees grow larger; hedges grow thicker; fine old buildings put to uses that were never originally intended or anticipated, as this building has been, are increasingly appreciated as time passes. But some other things are too seldom enhanced or improved by the workings of time.

Now, I am thinking of American city and suburban neighborhoods. On the whole, they have very chancy records of dealing well with time and change. This afternoon, I am going to discuss briefly four common kinds of failure for city neighborhoods and make a few suggestions. Of course, don't expect me to be comprehensive on such a subject in half an hour. The best I can do is mention some thoughts. And in the hope that they will stimulate more thoughts and maybe better thoughts by others.

My first suggestion concerns immigrants. Right now, right this minute, in locations extending from the Virginia metropolitan fringes of Washington and the Jersey metropolitan fringes of New York and the Los Angeles fringes of Los Angeles, striving immigrants from Pakistan, Bangladesh, India, China, and the Philippines, Latin America, the Caribbean, and Africa, are settling in woebegone city suburbs to which time has been unkind.

Right now, right this minute, these newcomers are enlivening some dull and dreary streets with tiny grocery and clothing stores, second-hand shops, little importing and craft enterprises. Skimpy offices and modest but exotic restaurants. Now, either of two fates can befall these newly minted immigrant neighborhoods. On the one hand, if members of the new populations and their children melt away as they find their feet the sequel for these neighborhoods will be a second influx of immigrants. Immigrants at the bottom of the ladder probably followed by yet another influx. Ample experience informs us that neighborhoods serving only as immigrant launching pads repeatedly take a step or two forward, followed by two or three steps backward, while dilapidation inexorably deepens with time. In contrast, as many a little Italy and Chinatown attest, along with less-celebrated examples, immigrant neighborhoods that succeed in holding onto their striving populations are neighborhoods that improve with time. They

become civic assets in every respect—social, physical and economic. Progress on the part of the population is reflected in the neighborhood. Increasing diversity of incomes, occupations and visions, education, skills and connections are all reflected as increasingly diversified neighborhoods. Time becomes the ally, not the enemy of such neighborhoods.

Self-respecting people, no matter what their ethnic origins, abandon a place if it becomes fixed in their minds that it is an undignified or insulting place to be.

Here's my suggestion: Smart municipalities ought to contradict that perception before it takes firm hold. No time to lose. By making sure that newly minted immigrant neighborhoods receive really good municipal housekeeping, public maintenance, and community precinct and fair justice services, along with some respectful amenities, too. Traffic taming and street trees come to mind. And especially quick, hassle-free permissions for people to organize open-air markets, if they want to and ask to. Or run jitney services, or make whatever other life enhancing and improving adaptations they want to provide for themselves. Many new immigrants bring along with them more expertise than Americans have in organizing and using such things.

Looking at local jitney services for local people, not for tourists, in the Caribbean, for instance. I wish that Americans had arrangements as well tailored to actual transportation needs and opportunities in their suburbs and thin city neighborhoods.

Simple straightforward municipal investments of the kind just mentioned and sensitive flexible bureaucratic adjustments of the kind just mentioned are minor in comparison with the costs and adjustments demanded by city mega projects. But if those minor costs and adjustment attach newcomers to neighborhoods in which they can feel pride and proprietorship as they are finding their feet and afterwards, they carry a potential of huge civic payoffs. Time and change will then have been enlisted as allies of these neighborhoods.

My second suggestion has to do with communities needs for hearts or centers and with a related problem. Damage done to neighborhoods by commercial incursions where they are inappropriate. The desirability of community hearts is well recognized nowadays. Much thought goes into designing them. For new communities, and inserting them into neighborhoods that have lost community hearts or never had them. The object is to nurture locales where people on foot will naturally encounter one another in the course of shopping, doing other errands, promoting their causes, airing their grievances, catching up on gossip, and perhaps enjoying a coffee or a beer under pretty-colored umbrellas.

Let's think a minute about the natural anatomy of community hearts. Wherever they develop spontaneously, they are almost invariably consequences of two or more intersecting streets well used by pedestrians.

On the most meager level, most meager scale, we have the cliché of the corner store or the corner pub that is recognized as a local hangout. In this cliché, corner is the significant adjective. Corner implies two streets intersecting in the shape of an X or Y. In traditional towns, the spot recognized as the center of

things surprising often contains a triangular piece of ground. This is because it is where three main routes converge in the shape of an Y. In communities where historically much traffic was water-borne, a heart often located itself at the intersection of a main waterfront street, joined with an exit from a busy dock where passengers disembarked.

When water travel declined, the heart moved elsewhere. Large cities of course have typically developed not only the localized neighborhood or district hearts, but one or several major hearts. And these also have almost invariably located themselves at busy pedestrian street intersections. All but the very smallest hearts, the corner store, typically provide splendid sites for landmark buildings, public squares, or small parks.

Now, the converse logic doesn't work. If I had more time, I'd regale you with dismal tales of wannabe hearts that lack the anatomy of intersecting well-used pedestrian streets. They are poor bets, indeed. They don't catch on or hold up. Living, beating community hearts can't be arbitrarily located as if they were suburban shopping centers for which the supporting anatomy is a parking lot and perhaps a transit stop. But given the anatomy of well-used pedestrian main streets, hearts locate themselves. In fact, they can't be prevented from locating themselves. Of course, the design can greatly enhance or reinforce them, as I implied with my remark about landmark buildings and public squares.

Now for the related problem of commercial or institutional facilities intruding into inappropriate places. From time to time, I glance at plans and artists' renderings for charmingly designed community hearts closely surrounded by charmingly designed residences with their yards. And I wonder where future overflow of commerce can be pleasantly accommodated. Perhaps this consideration doesn't matter in a village, which is destined to remain a village. But it matters very much in a city neighborhood or in a town or village, which becomes engulfed by a city. In cities, successful hearts attract users from outside the neighborhood. And they also attract entrepreneurs who want to be where the action is. These things happen. In fact, if these things didn't happen, cities would be little more advantageous economically and socially than villages. They wouldn't generate urban surprise, pizzazz, and diversity.

So, with time and change, originally unforeseen commercial and institutional overflows can occur in city neighborhoods. Where do they go? They may have to find and convert makeshift quarters. Occasionally the makeshifts are delightful, but most commonly they register as ugly, jarring, intrusive smears in the residential streets where they were never meant to intrude. Watching this happen, people think the neighborhood is going to the dogs. So it is, visually. And soon, as a sequel perhaps, socially. In the end, perhaps economically as well.

So much is this form of deterioration disliked and feared that one of the chief purposes of zoning regulations is to prevent it. Even if the regulations succeed at holding time and change at bay, as enemies, any success they have comes at the cost of squelching city potentialities, meaning new conveniences and innovations.

Here is where the anatomy of natural neighborhood hearts can come to the rescue. One important adaptive advantage of open-ended main pedestrian streets forming intersections is that these streets are

logical places for convertible buildings before there is need to convert them. They can be a designed form of neighborhood insurance, so to speak. For example, rowhouses can be designed to convert easily and pleasantly to shops, small offices, studios, restaurants, all kinds of things. Several joined together even convert well to small schools and other institutions. And of course, many buildings originally put up for work, especially loft buildings, convert pleasantly to apartments or living-and-working combinations.

Just as commercial and institutional enterprises in a city neighborhood or a town engulfed in a city can burgeon unexpectedly, so can they dwindle and wither unexpectedly. Those things happen, too. In that case, if shops and other facilities can be easily converted into added housing stock, the result is much better than boarded-up fronts. In sum, I am suggesting that urban designers and municipalities should not even think about attractive hearts, with their pretty-colored umbrellas, without also thinking about the indispensable street anatomy required by hearts. And they should not think about the street anatomy without also providing or encouraging easily convertible buildings on most streets, as opportunity to do this arises. This is a practical strategy for dealing with time and change as allies, not enemies.

My third suggestion concerns gentrification of low-cost neighborhoods to which time has not been kind, but which have valuable assets, nevertheless. Typically, the first outsiders to notice these assets are artists and artisans. They are joined by young professionals or other middle-class people whose eyes have been opened by the artists' discoveries whose connections, life skills and spending money can be socially useful to the neighborhoods' existing inhabitants and often are. As long as gentrification proceeds gently with moderation, it tends to continue beneficial and diversifying in every way. But nowadays, especially, a neighborhood's period of what might be called its golden age of gentrification can be surprisingly short. Suddenly so many, many new people want in on a place now generally perceived to be interesting and fashionable that gentrification turns socially and economically vicious. It explodes into a feeding frenzy of real estate speculation and evictions. Former inhabitants are evicted wholesale, priced out by what Chester Hartman aptly calls "the financial bulldozer." Even the artists who began the process are priced out. The eventual ironic result is that even the rich, the people being priced in, are cheated by this turn of events. They were attracted by what they saw as a lively, interesting, diverse, and urbane city neighborhood. In short, by the results of gentle and moderate gentrification, this kind of urbanity is being killed as the place becomes an exclusive preserve for high-income people.

Time is not kind to high-income preserves in cities, unless they are cheek by jowl with livelier and more diverse neighborhoods. One need only notice that many a poor and dilapidated neighborhood contains once-beautiful, proud, and ambitious dwellings to see evidence that exclusive preserves of the rich do not necessarily hold up well in cities.

The rich, it seems, grow bored with dull city neighborhoods. Or their children or heirs do. This is not surprising, because such places are boring. When gentrification turns vicious and excessive, it tells us first that demand for moderately gentrified neighborhoods has outrun supply of them. By now its appearance has revealed the basic attributes of such places. Attributes that the artists discovered. The streets have human scale, buildings are various and interesting, streets are safe for pedestrian use. And many ordinary conveniences are within pedestrian reach. And neighbors are tolerant of differing lifestyles.

A few weeks ago, I was in Richmond, Virginia, and I hadn't taken a real good look at Richmond for quite a few years. One of my nephews gave me a tour. And I was astounded and heartened to see neighborhoods that I remembered from the last time I had a tour as looking quite hopeless. Now very up-and-coming, very attractive, and people doing a lot of do-it-yourself repairs and changes on them. It was quite wonderful. And I was also charmed to see that these neighborhoods like this—such as the Fan district and the Boulevard, for those of you who know Richmond—looked very much as if they had been designed by new urbanists. That tells us something.

It's pitiful that so many city neighborhoods with these excellent basic attributes have been destroyed for highway construction, slum clearance, urban renewal and housing projects. Nevertheless, some currently bypassed treasures do remain. And where they do moderate gentrification—I emphasize *moderate*—could be deliberately encouraged to help take the heat off other places being excessively gentrified.

Another way of adding to supply could be by encouraging judicious infilling in neighborhoods with human scale, but not enough compactness and density to make good candidates. However, more than increased supply of desirable city neighborhoods is needed to combat socially vicious evictions of existing inhabitants. Artscape, a Toronto organization concerned specifically with protecting and promoting the interests of artists, has come to the conclusion that the only sure form of preventing artists from being priced out of their quarters is ownership. In this case, ownership by nonprofit organizations. The same is probably true for many other existing inhabitants. Ownership by cooperatives, community development corporations, land trusts, nonprofit organizations—whatever ingenuities can be directed to the aim of retaining neighborhood diversity of population.

My final suggestion concerns the hazards of a somewhat different form of popularity. As I mentioned earlier, some community hearts and their associated street anatomies attract many outsiders and are widely enjoyed. This is not a bad thing. On the contrary. The hazard is this: As leases for commercial or institutional spaces expire, tenants are apt to be faced with shockingly increased rates. Property taxes on popular premises can soar, too, instigating even further increases. If zoning prevents commercial overflow, so much the worse. The upshot is, many facilities are priced out of the mix. The hardware store goes, the bookstore closes. The places that repair small appliances moves away, the butcher shops and bakeries disappear.

As diversity diminishes, into its place comes a kind of monoculture. Incredible repetitions of whatever happens to be most profitable on that street at that time. Of course, these optimists don't all succeed. Six of the 17 new restaurants, say, die off rather rapidly, and five of the seven gift shops don't make it through the next Christmas. Into their places come other optimists who hope something will be left in the till after the debt costs on renovations and the incredible rents are paid. But starting gradually while times are good and rapidly when they aren't, the street becomes dotted with vacancies. The little conveniences don't return to fill them—they can't afford to. All this is not owing to competition from malls or big boxes. But because success has priced out diversity.

A popular main pedestrian street running through my own neighborhood is now afflicted by this dynamic. However, fortunately, the hardware store remains; so does the bookstore. One butcher shop with its

associated European grocery, and a large general bargain and outlet store. Not only do these remain, they flourish. The hardware has doubled its space. The secret of their stability is that they own the buildings where they do business and so are not vulnerable to being priced out by soaring rents. The banks also remain. They own their buildings.

This has caused me to think about home ownership. When it became public policy in the United States to encourage home ownership financial devices such as long-term mortgages, small down payments, and mortgage acceptance corporations and agencies, primarily the FHA proved successful at promoting the policy. Tract housing sold to homeowners under these arrangements was sprawling and otherwise ill-conceived for fostering much sense of community, but that is another matter. At least fostering ownership worked.

Today, some 65% of American households own their own houses or apartments, the highest percentage in the world. This has made me wonder whether similar techniques would enable or encourage small businesses, especially those whose success depends heavily on location, to own their own premises. Of course, not all would want to. And among those that did, all would not be able to. But that is also true of households. Why shouldn't it become public policy to foster business stability and stability of city streets and neighborhoods by enabling enterprises to protect themselves through ownership against abruptly rising rents?

In other words, I arrived at much the same conclusion as Artscape, that ownership is the sheerest protection against being priced out of a place of work.

These four suggestions may seem trivial compared with other municipal concerns, such as racism, poor schools, traffic, unemployment, illegal drugs, inadequate tax revenues, crime, persistent poverty, what to do with the garbage, how to lure tourists, whether to build another stadium or a convention center, and so on.

Nevertheless, neighborhoods that decline are pretty serious, too. Two steps forward followed by three steps back is no way for a city to progress. And it doesn't help solve other municipal problems, either. The pattern makes them more intractable. This pattern isn't new. It has practical causes, and unless these forms of civic ineptitude are faced and overcome, American city neighborhoods are as unlikely to deal well with time and change in the future as they've been in the past.

The suggestions I've made may not be politically possible. There may be better or at any rate different means of accomplishing similar aims. My purpose is to help stir up some creative thinking, now lacking about effects of time and change on city neighborhoods. Above all to stir up thinking about how to enlist time and change as practical allies, not as enemies that must be regulated out and fended off on the one hand or messily surrendered to on the other. We might as well learn how to make constructive alliances with the workings of time, because time is going to continue happening. That's for sure.

Any living thing is involved with time and with the changes that time brings, and that includes human beings; anybody who is raising children knows this. It involves repairing or restoring ecosystems.

Anybody involved in that understands that the hazards and the opportunities and the whole course of how things go is different with time. And it's true of city neighborhoods. So, to repeat myself, we might as well come to grips with this, I think. Thank you.

CAROLYN BRODY: I'm sure you'll all agree with me that the talk we've just heard is just as thought provoking as Mrs. Jacobs' many books. Thank you so much, Mrs. Jacobs, for your insights. I think you've been successful in stirring up some creative thinking.

Now we turn to the final part of today's program, which is a dialogue between Mrs. Jacobs and Professor Scully. And to moderate this dialogue, we're fortunate to have somebody who is a familiar voice and face to all of you: Ray Suarez. He has enjoyed a distinguished career in print and electronic media. Prior to joining the public television show, *News Hour with Jim Lehrer*, last year as a senior correspondent, he hosted the nationwide call-in news program *Talk of the Nation* on National Public Radio for six years. Mr. Suarez has a particular interest in urban affairs and received a graduate degree in this subject from the University of Chicago. And earlier this year he published a book titled the *Old Neighborhood: What We Lost in the Great Suburban Migration 1966 to 1999*. Ray, would you and Professor Scully please come up and join Mrs. Jacobs.

RAY SUAREZ: Well, it's a great pleasure for me to be asked to be here. I was quite surprised to find out that there had never been an encounter like this between Professor Scully and Mrs. Jacobs. History is replete with the stories of great meetings: Grant and Lee at Appomattox, Dr. King and Malcolm X in the early '60s, Jesus and John the Baptist. The list goes on and on. And it's great to be asked to be here for this encounter, and thank you both for having me. I want to begin by asking Vincent Scully to comment on what Mrs. Jacobs just had to say.

VINCENT SCULLY: When you mention all those great encounters, I was thinking of Phillipis. Well, I was delighted to see that Mrs. Jacobs whole sense of process whereby things happen and the city is alive and well and doing. It was, I thought, very illuminating. One thing that struck me very much, and it seems to me to go right to the heart of city-making, is Mrs. Jacobs' description of buildings near a center, a node, like that. Ideally being buildings that can be remodeled, that can have many different uses as time goes on. And I think that's absolutely fundamental. And I think it was for the lack of that that in modern architecture and in modern planning may be impossible for cities to be flexible and to grow. That is to say, the modernist idea was that every building had to be designed right down to one specific function, that is called solving a problem, and it was supposed to articulate however in complex way to serve that particular problem, which mean that if that function left it, it was hopeless what you do.

Now, the basic city building block that we know of Western civilization in one way or the other is the Italian palazzo. And the Italian palazzo is the perfect example of a building type, which is always the same. They're all the same. Therefore, you can make a city with them. But you decorate them differently, so that they're all different, but nevertheless they're the same and as time goes on, one family lives in it, or 20 families lives in it, or if it's a department store or a government office, it's all the same. It's still the basic block of the city, capable of encouraging life and continued remodeling basically. So I thought that

remark is essential, not only to the center of the city but to all of the city, the whole idea of how we think of architecture in a city. I mean I think you know the Italians in the Renaissance knew exactly what they were doing.

RAY SUAREZ: Let me jump in there, because the process that you explained is one that is rational and once you explain it, it seems apparent, but when faced with choices in the marketplace when people are looking to buy houses in the city, when businesses are looking to site in commercial areas. These are not the choices that we see them making right now. In fact, some of the opposite choices are being made. Places that were spawned in the suburbs, like Costco and Home Depot, are coming into dense urban areas, places in Brooklyn, close to downtown Cleveland, and plunking down there. A big box in a place that was never meant to have a big box anywhere near them.

JANE JACOBS: Well, I don't think it's so fearful to have a Costco or a WalMart or a Home Depot or whatever big box coming into a city. I'm in favor of all kinds of competition as a rule. And just think now department stores, large department stores used to locate in cities. And didn't ruin them. Wannamaker's came into Philadelphia and New York, and I saw them. And they were accommodated. They didn't—for one thing, they didn't require large parking lots around them. It's not the big box. It's the big parking lot. That's the blight.

RAY SUAREZ: The old department store was in the city.

JANE JACOBS: In the city, and the big boxes are in the city in that way. No harm done, I think, and in fact they often occupy things like the department stores that failed.

RAY SUAREZ: That main street in Pasadena is a good example of incorporating some big boxes and big names into a pre-existing shopping street.

JANE JACOBS: And I think it's interesting that a lot of our present-day understanding of convertible buildings and how well they can convert comes from the preservation movement, and the buildings were being saved for another purpose because, for aesthetic reasons, usually, because people just couldn't bear to see something so beautiful and so well made destroyed. Now if they couldn't bear to see it destroyed, they had to think what could be done with it and there you are with convertibility. The court house in Greenwich village that was just thought to you know like this building that it had to go. It turned out to be fine for a library but that kind of ingenuity came out of the preservation movement. And is still coming out of it. So that's part of this whole thing.

VINCENT SCULLY: One of the most conspicuous examples of that right now is David Shaw's great project in the Old Post Office to remake Pennsylvania Station, whose destruction started the preservation movement. And that final building can be converted.

JANE JACOBS: And it isn't needed for the post office anymore. It happened right here in Washington, not only this building, of course, but Union Station, which I went to look at. It's marvelous.

VINCENT SCULLY: And how horrible it was for a while. My god, not only the hole in it. The carpet which took away all the noise that it should be in a great space. The acoustics of architecture—it was horrible. You walk it was an acropolis, no sound. You once wrote about Chicago that you thought it was moribund. You said it's so quiet it makes your flesh creep.

RAY SUAREZ: But Chicago is one of the cities whose near-in neighborhoods are doing quite well today.

JANE JACOBS: Yes, and they're even going in for vicious and excessive gentrification, many of them now, they're so in demand.

RAY SUAREZ: But how do you keep the genie safely in the bottle? When you talk about moderate gentrification, I sat there listening and wondering how you engineer such a thing, because the need to realize a return on higher and higher up-front expenditures for later and later buyers can sometimes turn a neighborhood into a pyramid scheme but that doesn't mean any of the stake holders has the bravery to say you know what I'll take less for that house that I just paid through the nose for so as not to continue to bid up the neighborhood.

JANE JACOBS: No, I don't think you have to do that. I mentioned it a little while ago that I like competition. I like all kinds of competition. There can be competition that embraces nonprofit organizations. They can compete with profit organizations, such as Artscape wants to do. In fact, you often see that. There are sponsored things of various kinds that compete with things that don't have any sponsorship or any other purpose than making the most money. There are land trusts, there are neighborhood development corporations. We have a lot of instruments and potential instruments at our fingertips. They have mostly been used in very dilapidated neighborhoods to try to raze them to the point that somebody will want to gentrify them. But the same kind of things can be used in neighborhoods that are already undergoing gentrification, excessive gentrification. We forget this because for so long our governments were on the side of the exploiters, so to speak. The evictors, they called it "the highest and best use," by which they just meant the use that would make the most money in the short term. We have to get out of that mindset.

VINCE SCULLY: I thought when you talked in that vein, when you talked about home ownership being so important, I agree, but when you look back at a lot of things that are wrong with this, in part it was that FHA after World War II where nobody could rent any more and you had to go out in the suburbs and build a house if you were going to get a loan. But the renter used to be so important—say, in a city like 19th century New Haven, where we had this wonderful lower middle class, I guess it is a building type of two or three stories, front gables, two stories of porches, facing the street, really wonderful, and the owner would live on the second floor, usually and he'd rent the first floor. He had a family and probably students in the attic. So you had a three-dimensional social system right in one building, not zoned out into separate places. But if you don't have renters, you tend to lose that capacity for buildings that have multiple occupants.

JANE JACOBS: That's right, and people living over stores.

VINCE SCULLY: Oh, absolutely. It's so sad to go down to the main streets and see some of the stores still alive, but all the apartments are dark, gone.

JANE JACOBS: Well for one thing there are all kinds of regulations that you can't rent those places unless you provide some parking spaces, which it's impossible to do.

VINCE SCULLY: That's where most of our zoning is wrong, I mean most of our building codes are in the wrong direction.

JANE JACOBS: And there are other ones. You have to examine why you mentioned developers or storeowners and whatever destroying what's there because it's not feasible for what they want. Well, what makes it unfeasible, especially when it's a well-made building that can be converted. What makes it unfeasible very often are a whole lot of regulations that really have nothing to do with fire safety or not getting tuberculosis or whatever. And these do make it unfeasible to convert. And these can make it even more costly to convert than to build, knock something down and build a new building. But this is very foolish, this is wasteful in energy. It's all these regulations need to be examined carefully. To see what makes sense and what doesn't. The new urbanists had been fighting a battle on behalf of all of us, the battle against outmoded regulations. And they can't build decent neighborhoods with the permanent regulations. It's as simple as that. And you often can't build decent buildings and convertible buildings and reuse old buildings just because of indecent regulations.

VINCE SCULLY: When you say that, you know, I'm reminded when Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk were at Yale, they worked with really wonderful young teachers like Allen Greensburg and others in the neighborhoods. They really studied the neighborhood type and they also studied how to be able to keep people in the neighborhoods, how to prevent their eviction in terms of redevelopment. And I can remember them taking my seminar down and showing us how well those houses worked in relation to multiple use relations in the street. And one of the American planning type of the lot the sidewalk the grass strip the good granite curb on the street makes such a difference just that curb makes such a difference. As against that macadam road that they use out in the suburbs. And I was just thinking and talking of the new urbanism really started, even though its first successes had to be where the developers were willing to pay for it, what they now call "greenfield" developments. But now, as you know, they're finally being able to move back with the help of HUD and Hope Six, move back to the center of the cities. And I think in many places, it's very touching to see how. I don't mean to talk too much—this is your evening.

JANE JACOBS: No, I want to hear.

VINCE SCULLY: In New Haven right now there is a whole bunch of new houses, 414 units on 27 acres. It's pretty undense. I think it should be denser. But it's right where there was the old—there were the old high-rises and barracks of the worst period of public housing. And when you see these new houses on the new streets, that the mayor is so proud that he's reconstituted the grid of the streets. I like your diagram that the only illustration is the grid in *Death and Life*, which seems to me is a big part of the whole thing.

In that grid is something that is not only sparkling new and all that, but it's like the rest of America. And what we did with the poor in those was to condemn them to live in a that nobody else wanted in the United States. On the one hand modern architecture, but crummy modern architecture, and the kind that destroyed their families. High-rises and the barracks, and now you get the feeling, you see that everybody can be seen as a full citizen again. If the poor and the rich live in the basically the same kind of architecture, however different the scale, they cannot help but see each other in some ways. Brothers, rather than just enemies. Or as non-humans. And your book is full of that.

RAY SUAREZ: It's a counter model to the kind of architecture that you both propose, and the design in town planning that you both propose is very much with us in 2000. I unfortunately spent much of the day driving around Montgomery, Prince George's, and Howard counties in Maryland today. And the absolute antithesis of what you are proposing is built new every day. And there is earth-moving equipment flattening out lots to get ready to build more. Segregation of uses, no ability for a pedestrian to get very far or to any place that they really want to go. Talk about what kind of sidewalks you want. They don't have any kind of sidewalk at all, still. This we are told by builders and developers is a result of public choice, that when you ask people who are aspirational, who are trying to jump up a notch or two in class, this is what they want to buy. They want something that looks like the desired American dream house: some lawn, a car garage, multilevel living space, bedrooms upstairs and other functions down, and this is what you're getting. And ironically, when they've redeveloped sites inside the city they've moved that suburban model to back inside the city limits, to a place it was never even built.

JANE JACOBS: No, they don't any more. They used to, but they don't. Things have changed in the city. Now you see what I described and that seemed so heartening to me in Richmond, and this is not just in Richmond. This is an important phenomenon that you mentioned in Chicago that's occurring everywhere. Developers and bankers are very backward people. They get their ideas second- and third- and fourth-hand, and then they stick to them. It's painful for them to change. They have routines. And if they build shopping centers and the area that they're in is saturated with shopping centers, OK, then, go somewhere else and build shopping centers. They won't build a different kind of thing out of their routine. Now shopping centers, like big dams, are failing all over. Have you noticed that? But I'm sure that the people who build them are saying well this is what the public wants.

RAY SUAREZ: But what do you do with one of those shopping centers after it fails? It seems to me a pretty rigid impediment. Once it's there, you can't easily do something else with it.

JANE JACOBS: You know, I don't have to decide what you do with a shopping center. No, no it's not. I'm smarter than you think. I'm smart enough to know that every shopping center is a possibly a different conversion or replacement, whatever it may be. Tip O'Neill used to say all politics are local. Well, all building is local, too, and all conversions are local. And one reason we're in trouble with a lot of things is we tried to make one size fit all and not make it local.

VINCENT SCULLY: At Mashpee, they are turning a shopping center into a town as you know. It's a new urbanist project, which has been going on for about six years now. It's pretty interesting to watch it happen.

JANE JACOBS: Have you ever been to Split?

VINCE SCULLY: You mean in Yugoslavia?

JANE JACOBS: Yes. And there is Diocletian's palace. People moved into it just as if they were hermit crabs.

VINCE SCULLY: There's flexible building. Or in Orange, or places like that where for a long time the arena was the apartment house.

JANE JACOBS: You know another thing? I don't know why this is, but I don't understand these changes really, but every few generations there comes along a generation that can't stand what the generations before it did. And they get fairly ruthless with it. That happened at the end of Victorianism. It's what brought the end of Victorianism. And a lot of very fine buildings were destroyed then and a lot were hated for a long time and misused. They were associated with the repression and other things that people didn't like about Victorian times—fussiness, prissiness. I don't know, because life keeps bringing surprises, that take me by surprise and so I can't forecast anything, but I sort of see some signs of that kind of thing happening. And I think that these movements in the cities that we've talked about are part of that. I think that these suburbs that you are describing that are built just like yesterday's and the day before yesterday's, and we've had a pretty long run now, that that sort of arrangement is going to be seen as old fashioned, passé, not a step up. And that there will be infilling, there will be ruthless destruction of a lot of suburbs, too.

VINCE SCULLY: It's so hopelessly inconvenient when you come down, so many in terms of the amount of hours you have to drive, the aggravation on the road, so many things. I mean having to drive for everything, having to ferry kids everywhere.

RAY SUAREZ: Because people are making whatever necessary adjustments they need to do that.

VINCE SCULLY: But when they get an alternative—as for example, say, the new urbanism—they seem to go for it. And the developers are learning that that's the way they make money now is by most of them at least or many of them by doing new urbanism, because people seem to want it.

JANE JACOBS: By providing alternatives.

RAY SUAREZ: Do you think demographic change will push popular tastes? We're about to have the largest cohort of older citizens of any civilization in the history of the world.

JANE JACOBS: Hey, just like us.

VINCE SCULLY: I'm glad to be in your generation.

RAY SUAREZ: But maybe when there's 20 million more people in their 70s, driving everywhere won't seem like such a swell idea. I don't mean for the non-septuagenarians—I mean it just suddenly won't seem like you could put up with anything just to get through your daily life, maybe. I mean you think that kind of thing, a demographic shift can force the way we build, the way we design.

JANE JACOBS: I don't think any one thing like demographics will do it. It's a lot of things, but that could be one.

RAY SUAREZ: Because there will also be the largest generation of under-17s at the same time. Who also are very isolated.

JANE JACOBS: You know what? You're thinking like a marketer.

RAY SUAREZ: I was very interested in your point about immigrants, because now a lot of immigrant journeys in the United States are not starting in the historic center city the way they used to. They're starting in the suburbs, and they're staying in the suburbs.

JANE JACOBS: And they're starting wherever it's cheap enough for them to start and where there aren't barriers. And that's what they always did. The locales aren't the same; old launching pads are now popular with the middle class, like the north end in Boston. So nothing has changed. That's my complaint. Nothing has fundamentally changed about immigrant neighborhoods. They're in different locales, they may be in different places than they were, and so on, but the neighborhoods where they settle are still not respected and taken care of the way they should be, and there is not the attention to trying to make people attach to them. There is instead all the pressures, whether they are spoken or unspoken, to tell these people, "Hey you want to move up the ladder in America? Get out of here." Well, that's pretty helpless.

VINCE SCULLY: Jane do you know—I'm sure you do—one of the great successes that America had in immigrant housing was in the emergency of wartime low-cost housing in World War I. It was under, you know, the American Building Society and so on, and they built neighborhoods all the way up and down the Eastern seaboard, from Jacksonville up to Portsmouth, Maine. And most of these places were places where there were shipyards, factories, and they built the housing very close to the shipyards, so it's a really close relationship. And they went around and talked to the families who were going to be in that housing. Most of them were immigrants just come in to work, and they were trying to adjust it to the way they wanted to live, what they were going to do. And some of those housing groups now, like 7 in Bridgeport, alone which at that time was called the SN of United States, are gems, absolute gems. There's one, which touchingly enough is called Seaside Park and it's by some of the best architects in the states at that time. Shirlis and a bunch of others who actually after that went down and worked for Rockefeller in Virginia. But these houses formed a jewel of a neighborhood. It's this wonderful thing which is in perfect shape and where everybody wants to stay there. Everything you talked about. Right across the street, which is called Iranistand Boulevard, after PT Barnum. And there is a housing group that was built just before World War II, and it is the typical barracks. There's none of that sense of identity and who you are and where you are in it. That place has had to be completely rebuilt, and for a long period it was the center of drug distribution of Bridgeport. Right across the street, you had this totally different atmosphere.

So that people who say that the environment doesn't affect human life—

JANE JACOBS: They're crazy. The only thing crazier is to think that there aren't a lot of factors, some of them financial, some of them legal, and so on, that also affect human life, and they can be fighting with each other. Which is a state we're in now. We have a lot of repair work to do, legally and financially, that we drifted into. Not because it's necessary. Why do you suppose we're so stick-in-the-mud about changing these things?

VINCE SCULLY: I don't really know. Anything having to do with patterns of life people will resist and hold onto for a long time cause it's very strange out there if you do something new. What do you think? As you look at the city in 1961, as you look at it today do you feel markedly differently about it?

(Tape ends. The remainder of the dialogue is not transcribed.)