POLICY AND DESIGN FOR HOUSING

Lessons of the Urban Development Corporation 1968-1975

OPEN FORUM June 11, 2005, 4:30 - 5:15PM

OPEN FORUM 4:30 - 5:15PM

Symposium Saturday June 11, 2005, 9:00am–6:30pm
@ CUNY Graduate Center, 365 Fifth Avenue at 34th Street, New York City

LEADERS:
Theodore Liebman, FAIA
Roberta Gratz - Journalist and Urbanist

TED LIEBMAN: What we're going to do next is a wrap up. To do this, we have Roberta Gratz as our facilitator. Roberta Gratz, just like her e-mail address, is in fact a human living city, and she is a person who thinks about, wonders about and writes about the city and the qualities of the city, and she will, after listening to what has happened all day will talk about it. Then I'm going to get these two microphones, and we'll come down here, and we'll answer questions. Then we may decide to have a wonderful cocktail party.

ROBERTA GRATZ: I feel like a little bit of the outsider in this love-feast. I didn't work for Ed Logue and as a journalist, I did not have a very good encounter with Ed Logue. My experience was not positive and a lot of the things that he said and at least represented to me were not very positive at the time. However, there's been a lot said of all the positive values that came out of his leadership and of UDC, but I think there's been from what I've heard, something of a disconnect between all the issues of good design that so many of you spoke of and worked at, and some of the methods through which they were applied. Logue certainly understood good design. He also understood, only understood the big vision it seems: New construction, intricate finance, top down, taking cleared sites that no one else wanted to develop, the sort of leftovers from the very misjudged kind of slum clearance programs but he wasn't adverse to the idea of clearing neighborhoods. He was not neighborhood sensitive, and one of the most extraordinary stories I ever heard, was yes there was mention of his learning as a bombardier, and he acknowledged that he learned all he needed to know about redevelopment as a bomber pilot in World War II and what San Francisco needed was a new earthquake and then what a beautiful city we would build. That's often forgotten, but there are these real contradictions now a lot of you who worked among, worked together and under him, saw a different side than a lot of the public did and experienced. So how do you judge the success?

Last night it was mentioned about Newburgh, was the first city mentioned as a matter of fact, that I forget who it was, had gone to and UDC went in and built housing. Newburgh is still and has always remained a devastated city. The difference is that today, there is housing on the waterfront in a way that it shouldn't be, and the rest of the city has been falling apart, although there are things happening, percolating from the bottom up that have nothing to do with big programs, but the real question through all of this, is how do you judge the success, when in a lot of places that UDC intervened, the same conditions exist. Now you can't blame Ed Logue for the federal reneging of commitments, but you can ask the question, what was the wisdom of the financial system that brought the State to the brink of bankruptcy in 1975? It was, the programs

were ambitious, they were, some of those programs represented innovative ways to get things done, and represented by so many of you, UDC did draw dedicated public service people, with a great social conscious and with innovative design talent, but one can also acknowledge that Logue promoted, at least from within and from the top, important values, the idea of thinking about employment, about education, thinking about day care centers, all at the same time as building housing. This is not the norm today. As Ron described, he did inspire students in a kind of funny way, through some of the programs in New Haven, inspired some of the students who then went out and became the community developers, not necessarily the top down type.

I think looking at the programs and some of the projects that are, were in the exhibit yesterday, and talked about all day today, covers the full spectrum, it's very interesting, it's a full spectrum of design issues since the 1970's, some of which have come and gone, some of which have become everyday aspects of our built environment: modular housing, security issues, which kind of heat, whether it should be electric or not, skip stop elevators, forgot about those, courtyards, how we deal with public space. These were all issues that were part of your agenda, whether they were, the solutions were correct or not is a different issue. At least they were part of the dialogue. Mixed use housing for large families, mid-rise/high density, I'll say something more about that later, even accessibility, what a novel idea, back then. It's important to acknowledge the sensitivities of the time, feeling, it was said by a number of people, that the feeling was that something big had to happen, but that's not what everybody was saying, and one should ask and there should be more discussion of what was being listened to, what was being said, and what was being ignored.

Today, everyone loves to quote Jane Jacobs, but her first book was in 1961. I didn't hear any discussion of that, and where that fit in to what was going on, but i can say Ed Logue, to me, did not have good things to say about Jane Jacobs. I though Frank Braconi last night, raised some very important questions that I don't think were addressed enough, maybe touched on. He asked: were the objectives and the tools the right thing for the time? A lot of you said they were, but I didn't hear what any of the discussion was about alternatives, so how do you know they were right if you're not really talking about what the choices were. Communities at the time, he pointed out were demanding more of a role in their future, and he also noted and I think this should be discussed more, maybe the need was to nurture those movements, those community based stirrings that did evolve, and this was part of the larger context. So what could UDC have done to stem the tide of abandonment at the time, and not just focus on the new construction and the new design and what could UDC have done to be more of a partner, a nurturer of some of the community activity that was stirring.

It was noted that between 1967 and 1975, New York City alone lost half a million units. Well, you're talking about the number of units that were built, all well and good, but what was being done about not losing the units that were lost? In my mind, I've often used the metaphor, it's like putting a new porch on a crumbling house. The question is which do you do first and can you do both at the same time. That's a lot of what is being said, done, talked about today, I didn't hear anyone discuss whether that was part of the conversation back then, I don't know if it was. Those of you who were in it, do know and if it wasn't, it's worth noting. As John Stainton pointed out, most of what we're getting today, is being done by the CDC's in partnership with developers.

That didn't happen through any kind of top down public policy. That happened because of the bubbling up from the community groups, from the activists, and you know, so one has to continually ask, what would of, could of happened if there had been a partnership?

Roosevelt Island I think is very interesting. Everybody comes back to it. There's no doubt it had a lot of innovations, some of which I had even forgotten about , the vacuum garbage collection, the subway stop that was brought to it, the parking, the walking area, the local schools, the disabled accessibility, but Roosevelt Island since it's inception, has taken an enormous amount of public investment. I saw Suzanne Stephens last night, each with our notebooks in hand in front of the exhibit, saying to each other, we have to go back and look at what we wrote back then about these things, and I went back to my first book, where I mentioned Roosevelt Island among other things, because it was in some ways an expression of the planned shrinkage notion. The investment that was going into a lot of the new communities was not going into the existing communities for very specific reasons, and when I think of the kind of investment that went into Roosevelt Island, at the time I asked, and I still think it's a legitimate question, what would have happened if some, if even half of that investment, went into the existing communities? How many more units would we have saved, restored, and in effect created then were created only by new construction. Maybe innovative financing was guaranteed to fail because it was so dependent on the kind of subsidies and bonding that brought us to that financial problem era.

So, I started making a list of what I thought were lessons that have not been learned, that could have been out of the positive aspects or even the troubling aspects of the UDC experience. How do you balance top down and bottom up? I was amused by Bob's reference, 10 years of Ed Logue and 10 years of community based planning, I don't think so and I don't think we have the answer today, although I think there are some examples in different places, but the real question is how do have strong leadership? How do you have strong government agencies, but still have strong community based development and leadership coming together and not always in battle? There was a lot of good stuff that was not built and the question is why? What were the lessons there? I had forgotten about the 1970 MOMA show on high density/low rise housing. Now, boy is that a lesson that hasn't been learned because all we are doing today is low density and it is the worst thing we can be doing if we are really talking about regenerating our cities. About being smart about growth, being about sustainability, green development and saving our farms, our mountains, our green spaces, because if we don't think about density for the cities, then density in the right way and not confusing density with congestion and not assuming that all density has to be high rise.

Ed Logue did not learn the lessons of the successful UDC years when he got to the South Bronx. One of the worst new projects perpetrated on a City is Charlotte Street. Ranch housing with picket fences in the South Bronx, give me a break. This is not what should have been. It is not argued about. It is not discussed. In fact, it's pointed at, pointed to as a great success. Why? And this was the standard. It brought developers into that neighborhood, and that was the mark of success, not whether it was the right thing for the right place. It's not enough I have to say to the advocates of affordable housing, to advocate for affordable housing, but to advocate for the right kind of affordable housing, which must include density and not single family housing with parking garages or car ports within blocks of mass transit on the inner city neighborhoods, of

our city or any other, and unfortunately, the biggest federal program we have in terms of housing investment is Hope Six, and I only know of one Hope Six project in this entire country that has not eliminated affordable units while building what is often considered very attractive and applauded for its mix of in economic, its economic and perhaps racial mix, but very few if anyone points out the fact, that is has caused the next generation of real problems because it has put a lot of people out there, who can't find housing except in the next marginal neighborhood, which will be the next slum in the years ahead. It's a real issue. And this is definitely a lesson that was not learned that I had not realized was such a important component of UDC in terms of understanding the density issue. Clearly, the lesson of innovative design has not been learned, of public responsibility. We've gone the other way on that. The idea of that government and the public has responsibility for affordable housing is, obviously, we all know where that is.

I thought it was an interesting point that I had forgotten, that it was a value at UDC to put affordable housing in first in a new development. Now, it's rare to get it at all, let alone first, but it's clearly if you go to any of the successful communities in this country that are integrated, you see what came in first was the low-income community, not after, which is when you get the kind of democracy that Larry was talking to when they vote out, they don't want the low -income coming in, what, you know, it's closing the barn door after you're inside, but in this case, the value of putting it in first, and then letting the market take its shape around, is a very important lesson that I don't see has been learned or at least well learned: the lesson of paying attention to the social and economic needs of a community. Today, I see this so much around the country and certainly here as well. The idea of developing housing is thought of and said in the same breath as creating or regenerating communities and neighborhoods, and they are not the same. You don't build a neighborhood by just building housing. But that's a lesson that was not learned. The questioner before noted the lack of training for citizen activists, raised a very interesting point that really goes beyond just even that question. People live holistic lives. We do not learn holistically, and we do not approach our built or our natural environment holistically and our schools certainly do not teach holistically about any of these issues, she was absolutely right, and we don't teach within the lower schools and I have to confess, we don't teach it in the journalism school either. And this is a very important point that really needs more discussion and I think we're getting to that although I didn't hear as much of those connections in the discussion here, but you do hear more and more people thinking about the connection between issues.

The lesson that I was so intrigued to hear Ted describe that he and Nina spent a year living abroad in all these successful housing or not successful housing projects, and learning from living in them and making Richard Meier live in an apartment and all that kind of thing, it's true you need to design for the user, but as noble as it is to go and live in the place you design, to learn, you don't really have to have that experience, but you do have to listen to the user and listen to the person you're designing for that can be as useful and perhaps more useful a lesson than actually living there yourself, because you're not living there on a permanent basis. And as far as the holistic idea, that what somebody said is we take earth science in school but most of us live in cities. It's a very interesting observation. The question of, do we need an agency to knit together the education ideas, the amenities, the eating, playing and working elements of a community. I don't think that it is an agency that is required here. I do think it is an education in, and a discussion, a dialogue kind of thing that really needs to happen more, and I have to confess, well,

I don't have to confess this, I'm no longer a member of the daily press, so I can be critical of the daily press, but we don't read about this in the press. We don't read about the connections of these issues, and if anything the vocabulary on these issues in the press is really wanting. The idea that the poor deserve quality is an idea that is a lesson that has not been learned. The need for high standards in affordable housing is one that I can remember being debated way back when I was still a reporter and people were horrified, building, a couple of towers that went up in Harlem, they gave them air conditioners. How dare they? Well this is clearly a standard that somehow has not continued as part of the discussion and not a lesson learned. Then, Tony made some interesting points, that when he said, ahh--let's see, how did he say it--we were not smart enough to resolve the conflict between prototype and context. We were kamikaze architects imposing our designs. We knew better, but we couldn't do anything about it. We knew who we represented but we couldn't act on their behalf. Well, I don't know about that and I would challenge those of you in the architecture profession, this is a discussion that should be going on in your profession and its something that Stephen Goldsmith alluded to: I think its time that architect's didn't always blame it on the client.

There are opportunities and I sure some of you have taken them, but there should be more taken when architect's stand up and say no, that's not the right way to do and if that's the way you want it done, then as Philip Johnson said, the first thing is to get the job, and I would say the first thing is to say no to the job. It's easy for me to say. I'm not an architect but then again I do say no to a lot of things. It seemed at the end, it was very interesting for me to here how much Related was doing it, was doing in terms of the facilities it was buying, and I couldn't help but think, that if Related can do it, can do what was described and do it at a considerable profit, it must mean that all of what you've been talking about and discussed here today, can happen again, but for less of a private profit, more of public commitment, with more public values, embodied in the work and again, by the public realm. And it seems to me listening about the new architects, not just coming out of the Rose Fellowship, but we're hearing about coming out in different ways working for not for profits on their own.

The answers it seems are going to be with the new visionaries. They are answering the question. They are visionaries. They're answering the question of what is the new mechanism to fill the need. It's not led by one visionary person or singular agency, but with new alignments among many groups, perhaps more of a balance between the top down and the bottom up I think its happening in many different configurations around the country as well it should, since every place is different. So there is a new generation of practitioners emerging at a very interesting time. They are thinking holistically. They are working holistically. They're about the connections between public health, environmental; justice, transit, education, social facilities. They're connecting the dots of real life, while strengthening the communities and building housing, but the housing component is only one of many components of a whole picture. So this should give us all new hope that the pioneering work that a lot of you did will continue. And I can't help but close with a favorite expression of mine that for those of you who know me, know it is something of my mantra. Seems to me that a lot of small things are happening in a very big and good way. Thank you.

TED LIEBMAN: I think people have to realize that UDC was a program that was established to build housing, and it did that well. It was not a general hospital. It was not education program, but it asked that education be included in its developments. It began to search out all of the inadequacies of the housing program and each and every month it began to suggest new ways to broaden our spectrum, but its main purpose was to create housing, and it frankly did that very, very well, and very quickly. The mistakes we made in year one, year two, year three, we hoped they were slightly remedied in year four, year five, year six, and no one thought that the federal government, the state government, and the city would all go belly up all at once basically, and stop our programs. We were a marvelous scapegoat at that moment, but we have to sort of even out the playing field, and I think we didn't do everything perfectly, but what we did do well was begin to broaden the vision of housing and the vision of neighborhood. Had we continued, some of the small infill projects that would have happened in those neighborhoods, that, where we took sites, we were not given better sites, and we only took sites that were given and we filled those holes, we couldn't complete and it's a shame that we couldn't. It's a shame that many of those neighborhoods didn't get better, but some of them did and the influx of housing surely provided at least for those 32,100 families, a place to live. Still the comment that John made about the architect, the African-American architect, met me at a Housing Committee meeting at the New York AIA, and said, "oh, you were involved in Marcus Garvey. I became an architect because I grew up in Marcus Garvey." Now that is something that at least gave one person some inspiration about livability, and now I would love in this wrap up, to have you make comments, you all have been listening and we've been talking so I would love to hear a few comments.

NINA LIEBMAN: I am glad that Roberta picked up on Kathleen Kelly's comment about getting people to become educated and aware of how they can influence their environment and their housing situation, and I'm just wondering if there can be some AIA or other group who could create a program to go into the public schools and try to give students some tools, because in fact attitudes are formed by the time someone is nine years old. We know that through pedagogical research, so it could be very important to let young people, even in elementary school, understand what control they have over their room, their apartment, their neighborhood, their street, and what sorts things they could do to control their own environment with creativity. I think that would be a very good project for some people to take off. Jerry [Maltz], maybe the Foundation could do that.

PAUL SEGAL: Well, excuse me, it's such a great idea that Jerry Maltz started many years ago with a whole bunch of people and the New York Foundation, which I was privileged to be the president of several years, runs this program, it's called Learning by Design. I invite you all to go onto the web site to learn about it and to participate in it. It sends architect's into New York City public schools from first grade through 12th grade, kindergarten excuse me, kindergarten through 12th grade. I viewed it as part of a 50 year program. Some are saying 10 or 20 years. I think that's very modest. You have to think of it as a 50 year program of a commitment to teaching the public form five years old on up, and saying this is not something you are going to get done in 10 years or 20 years. It's going take may generations. We teach kids how to read and write and add from kindergarten through 12th grade, and we never teach them how to look, and that's what this program is about. As I say, part of what we did for several years, was something called the Harlem School Initiative, and we sent a whole bunch of people up and we reached just in Harlem

kids from six through nina for several years, very concentrated in several schools and ran the program over and over again in the same schools. So it really took root in those schools. It's a program that reaches 5,000, 7,000 kids a year in public schools. So, it's a great idea and I thank you for appreciating it.

NINA: Are you doing any longitudinal research to see whether what you are imparting is in fact getting into the later years of these kids or their decisions about careers or how they're participating in the community as a result of this?

PAUL SEGAL: We have put all our resources into getting the people into schools. Part of is, is although we've had a lot of volunteers which has been wonderful, we've also had a lot of paid educators that we've had to raise money for. So that's the program

NINA: So it goes on?

PAUL: Oh yeah, very much so, and in fact, at the Center for Architecture, one level down from the street level, the so called mezzanine level, I love the way they call everything mezzanine in all these things. It's the first cellar. In the first cellar there is the New York Foundation for Architecture's offices, and the room on the right is the work room, and they're all kinds of housing models. These kids do amazing things. They look at their neighborhoods, and the program is integrated into. It's not a stand- alone program. It's integrated into the rest of their education . So they look at their neighborhood, at the sociology of it, they write stories about it so it's part of their English course. They do math, science. They do every course in relation to this so it's part of the overall program going back to Roberta's point about holistic education. It is very much part of the rest of the curriculum. It's not a stand-alone separate item. It's part of their life, the sociology of their neighborhood, and just teaching people how to look and see what's around them. So they have a wonderful program.

ROBERTA: Following up on that, the question also is, where do they go with it and who listens to them because any of us who have watched students talk and explore their neighborhood, they get it pretty easily, quickly in many ways, the question is, do people, policy makers, designers, architects, whatever, go, even ask them, do they encourage their involvement in that process that leads to the solution to their neighborhood?

JERRY MALTZ: Well very interesting. Good question. Last year, one of the things that we had, which was supported by the MTA design team, we had a group of kids from an area that will be on the Second Avenue subway. These kids came down to Central Park, and actually spent an entire day there, and they designed a subway station of their dreams, and the folks from the MTA Design Group were there, and there was a lot of back and forth about it. It was very exciting for them as well as the kids. In terms of careful studies. This is a very shoe-string operation and we're really taking the first step. There are a lot of steps that would be wonderful. Contributions are more then gratefully accepted, and if somebody wants to fund doing a study great, we'll do a study.

ROBERTA: I wasn't suggesting a study. I was just suggesting I think it's great if they're being brought into the process. You don't need a study, just bring them into the process.

JERRY MALTZ: I would like to follow up on that with a little more information. The program started virtually in 1990. It's expanded since. We go into schools to teach. We have gotten numerous repeated requests so that schools are becoming more aware of the program. Since the Foundation and the AIA moved to the Center for Architecture, the program has expanded further by holding workshops at the Center for Architecture periodically, not only orientated toward teachers and schools, and we do teacher training as well. This is another important aspect of what we do, so that teachers who are with the kids everyday, become more aware of their physical environment and how they can use information about the physical environment to relate to their other, the rest of their academic curriculum. Using the physical environment, which the kids know a great deal about their own neighborhoods, they can teach us as teachers, and I've done a fair amount of teaching within this program. I've learned a good bit about various neighborhoods in the city through that. So there's an interesting exchange and the kids become empowered by knowing that we feel that this is important. They see their neighborhoods every day. To have someone who is an authority figure, talk about something in their neighborhoods as being worth, worthy of consideration, gives them a great feeling. So they begin to understand a bit a bout how their neighborhood comes into being and how they can start to make decisions about the future of their neighborhood.

Very specifically on July 22nd, a Friday, all day, there is going to be a program at the Center for Architecture, where a group of high schools students are going to come and work on a project which relates to the housing exhibit, the UDC housing exhibit and the City for Art exhibit, to the two exhibits that are currently at the Center for Architecture. So that will be another normal application in the terms of learning by design of how we are reaching out and trying to make the physical environment a much more important part of the curriculum, within the K12 curriculum within the City of New York. If any of you are interested in participating on July 22nd, but please let us know in advance if you're going to come.

TED: On behalf of the, all architect's in New York, God bless Jerry Maltz. He does an incredible job. I think ever since he left UDC, he decided that, I can't do any more good, because this place stopped, now I'm going to do it for the public forever, and he's been unbelievable.

JERRY: It was after I left UDC, that I started to become an environmental psychologist.

ROBERTA: Just as a little side note. There's a program, Ministries for Truth and Justice, is that the right name Ron?

RON SHIFFMAN: Yes.

ROBERTA: In the South Bronx that it blew me away a number of years ago when I discovered that these kids, teenagers were being given Bob Caro's "Power Broker" to read to understand why their neighborhood was what it is. Before the next question, I'm going to recognize the young lady who has not yet spoken or asked a question, but I'm urged by Ted to respond to what

he said, and I don't want to get into a kind of debate between us because I don't really think it is a debate. I think the point is, for those of you who were very involved in something, there are questions that you need to ask even to challenge your very rosy view sometimes of what you were part of because there was a larger context and there were other things being said and the question was, should there have been some challenge to what the program was, and what the lessons were and whether they were being learned internally, and it seemed to me that I was trying to point out there were a lot of important values expressed there that seemed to die unfortunately with the agency, because some of those lessons have not been learned. And I think that that's where the interesting conversation should be, not how important those things were or weren't, but what was their impact going forward and where is their impact today? We know that a lot of that of great value. The question is where did it go beyond the context of what you were working in? Can I now go to the next question?

AUDIENCE: This is less of a question. Maybe a comment and then a suggestion. I guess because I didn't know so much about the UDC, when I started as a planning student, I was interested in the topic, just listening to, I came to the discussion in April where I met Ted, and just listening to the talks today, I guess one of the things that struck me was that, people kept asking like what would this person do if he had been around now, and one of the lessons I think I learned form this particular forum is that leadership has to be flexible, and it's less about the specific person in a specific place, but more about how a leadership structure can be flexible enough to maneuver within like the existing socio-political structure, and I want to suggest, that in addition to seeing how, I guess how the architects have one perspective on how this will happen, it would be nice to see some other housing community activists who work specifically with kind of building that bubble up because they seemed to be the ones, also in the trenches who are trying to maneuver around and trying to figure out where the existing power structures are and how you can maneuver them to get housing policy pushed through. So I wondered, it seems like this is going to be a continuing discussion, are there any plans by the organizers of those conferences to include those types of people in the discussions with the architects, especially if the architects are going to be working with them, like they were talking about the man from the Rose Foundation. Can you speak to that a little?

TED: I believe in advocacy very much and I think we're housing advocates, or I've been a housing advocate all my life, but I frankly I've become exhausted with meeting after meeting after meeting of a group that keeps talking around and around an issue and doesn't move forward, and that has always been my problem. You know, I've participated with Ron [Shiffman] in three years of discussion with R-DOT, trying to somehow influence what was happening downtown with ground zero, and it was a wonderful discussion and it healed us but, you know, I'm concerned that, we did our best, but we didn't have the power and I miss being able to move things forward. It's a tragic, I know, maybe Ron can speak to it better than I, but in a sense, it's exhausting for me to participate week after week and month after month in something when I know that the end result is going to be; an advisory role but without the powers that be are going to then make 100% of the decisions. Is that a terrible thing to say? I'm saying that so you can say something else.

AUDIENCE: I mean I think on some level that doesn't quite get at my question. It's more like, I think there are lots of community process which are messy and it takes a long time some times, a lot of times actually, but I think on some level, there are sometimes these presuppositions about what community process can be and like who people involved. I mean I, myself, hate tons of meetings but I work with enough community groups to know that, they don't all have to be like that, nor are they all like that, but it also depends on the scale of the project that you're working on, and if you're talking about something as involved as developing a comprehensive housing policy for New York City that's really dynamic, then of course the process is going to be long, messy and involve everybody, or I mean it could be. But I mean that's just something to expect, but then there are mechanisms to put in place where it can move the process along. It just seems like, that's sort of a big piece of the housing policy when you talk about people advocating how, if architects want to work closely with people who are advocating for these changes, how, its seems hard to kind of leave them out of the process. I just wanted to know what people thought...

RON SHIFFMAN: I happen to think you're absolutely right, and had the Mayor been engaged in a community process, we would have the Olympics in 2012. The fact that he wasn't is the reason that we're not having it, or not being competitive. Community processes, I would argue, an engagement of the community in a democratic way, is what begins to educate them. You don't set up in schools. That's important. I'm not getting away from that. I think the civic programs. I think building up and what Jerry's done is terrific, but the way to get people engaged is by giving them power and by listening to them, and the only way people get power is by taking it, and I really suggest that when you engage people, the process moves a lot faster. Ed Logue, and I've learned this from you, could go into to Brownsville because people had been talking about rebuilding Marcus Garvey, before he came there, and so that when he came there, he was the builder that they could embrace. He couldn't do the same in the Bronx because people weren't talking about it, so it was a little bit more alien. And I do think, and he couldn't do it in Bedford [Westchester] because people hadn't laid the ground work there over the years, and because people were not able to deal with racial divides and wedge politics in such a way, so Ed Logue needed the police to go, State troopers to Bedford, New York, this wealthy community, but where they were working on the ground and wanting to see their neighborhood invested in, he was able to come in.

And I disagree with Roberta. Roberta and I have this great friendship and we always agree on 98 percent, but I disagree with one thing you said today, and that was, when you talk about planned shrinkage, building Marcus Garvey was not planned shrinkage, building Twin Parks was not planned shrinkage. What CHPC did, and our friend yesterday was the advocate of planned shrinkage, was to move investment away from low-income neighborhoods. What Logue was doing is he was coming in and building on places that could become the anchors for the redevelopment of the surrounding areas. What happened, and the other point I disagree on, is, there would not bea housing unit built in New York, if you don't have consistency in public policy, and the inconsistency that occurred when Nixon impounded those monies, when there was a commitment by the federal government for a long stream of revenue into housing for many, many years, if we abort that at any point in time, anything will go bankrupt. It's the same as losing your job and having to repay your mortgage. If all of a sudden what you thought was your security

was gone. Any community based group who is worth their salt, and they've built a lot in New York. They built 400,000 units, 80 percent of them by community based groups, have put together those deals with mirrors, sweat and mirrors and that's exactly what Ed Logue did and that's where we learned it from. And I think it's really important to understand and not blame a victim of an inconsistent federal policy with the potential for the bankruptcy of New York. I think what we really needed to do was to stand up, a little bit louder and tell the President at that time, to drop dead, rather than his message to the City, which was drop dead.

ROBERTA: That was Ford [Foundation]. The reference to planned shrinkage wasn't specifically to the projects. It was the idea that all the investment was going into new things and none going into the existing communities, and that was the policy, I didn't say it was the Logue policy, it was the larger policy, but that's what the result was in terms of tying in. When you only invest part of one part of the equation, the other part of the equation suffers, and that's what happened in that era.

TED: I agree, but when you're doing that, there wasn't a program to do the other thing, or if there was, they weren't doing it.

AUDIENCE: I'd like to follow up on the questioner's suggestions. I think the Center for Architecture in its ability to reach out to communities, should start having programs for community groups in creating dialogues with the architectural community, because I know that there's a lot of programming going on at the Center for Architecture, but I don't see that being part of it and I think that should be part of the programming.

JUDITH BERDY: Here's one thing to think about. As you said, the comment about Roosevelt Island, if they didn't build this humungous community, how much more could be built? If they had not bulldozed, what was already on Roosevelt Island, it was a stock of gorgeous buildings, maybe not the best quality in the world, but excellent, beautiful buildings, and it kills me, because I'm a historian, I have pictures of every single one of them, to look at this beautiful 19th century, early 20th century stone buildings, not concrete, I'm sorry, that were demolished, and I think the City sort of had a demolition festival that Mayor Lindsay started, and bulldozed 40 buildings at one time, and if you just think back, and I'll be glad to show anyone who wants the pictures of what the island could of had, it would of needed new, but it could have had both, it would of been such a better place, but that's just something to think about.

AUDIENCE: I have an observation and kind of a modest proposal. This seminar or symposium rather, has been a worthwhile experience for me. I got a chance to see some people that I thought a lot of and still think a lot of, a lot of time has passed, but nonetheless you could feel the sort of magnetic attraction between us because of our stay at UDC. And you, Ted have said, this symposium is an attempt to start to build a record for people out there in the future who want to know more about what happened and how it happened and what was involved. And I hope that there's a way to add to what's happened today and last night because I understand the exhibit ends in September, and wouldn't it be nice to have a kind of wrap up program with some panels that would include...

TED: I'm glad you suggested that. (laughter)

AUDIENCE: Wouldn't it be nice to have a kind of wrap of program with some panels that would include some of the things I feel are missing here and it's, it really has to do with time I think. The users are not here. The users need to be here to tell us what it was like to be in that UDC project that was built. What did they like about it? What didn't they like about it? Because if we're trying to establish a record, we need to hear from them. We need to hear their voices.

TED: On July 21st and September 10th, community based groups will be meeting at The Center for Architecture for wrap up sessions, just based on what happened here and the exhibit that's there, and discussions that will happen in between. We don't mean this to be the end of the dialogue. We mean this to be the beginning of a dialogue, one that I think needed to first firmly base us, what happened then because there frankly was so little knowledge of what happened during those seven years. And now we have to move forward with the thoughts that are being recorded by Steve, will be on record for everyone to hopefully learn from, but carry on from, because in one day, it's very hard to think a vision, but it is enough time to absorb the past and begin to realize that we better start thinking of a future.

AUDIENCE: I'm happy to hear that community groups will be engaged in ways that will be beneficial to them and to the listeners. I was really talking about users of UDC projects--People that lived in the projects that UDC built. I think it would be great to have them, as part of the perpetual record of what UDC was all about. And then secondly, I think that the architects who actually worked on projects, although there's a little bit of it today, we didn't hear really what were they thinking when they designed this project. Why did they make certain decisions in the way that they did? I think that would be another worthwhile chapter to add to the record that's being created here, to understand you know really what was Sert Jackson's office thinking about when they created those courtyards, and did it work from their point of view, or didn't it work from their point of view.

ROBERTA: It would have been useful if those users had been part of this program, and it would be useful if a lot of the architects are part of the community programs that come up in the Center because it's, I think Susan's point is bringing them together, not having separate programs. More questions, is there, oh we're out of time?

AUDIENCE: I'm a user

ROBERTA: Wait a minute. Let's have one last question from a user. Let her be the closing remark.

AUDIENCE: I am a very delighted 25 year resident of Eastwood in Roosevelt Island. I have an incredible apartment with river views, wonderful neighbors, many friends. I will be 75 years old in July and these have been the 25 happiest years of that time. I'm very, very grateful to live on Roosevelt Island, and to all of your work.

END