can be good things, and their acceptance can be seen as a measure of urban design's success. But it is just as possible that urban design shares with Postmodernism more broadly the fate of having provided historical themes with which to put a *happy face* on hackneyed commercial development.

To what purpose was urban design as a theory first dedicated, and how has it recalibrated its agenda in the subsequent fifty years? In the United States urban design emerged during the period when every person—including ethnic minorities, the poor, and women—finally gained, in theory, the legal right to occupy and pursue happiness in the shared spaces of the American city. With this expansion in democratic access, the identity of the public began to splinter and hybridize from one that had been chauvinistically Anglo-Saxon into a range of not only transnational identities—African American, Italian American, Asian American, and so on—but also others reflecting differences of gender, class, and geographic affinity. Our society is now arguably, and in most ways for the better, made up of a contending array of overlapping "publics" who compete for representation within the spaces they occupy. Ironically, or perhaps just predictably, this increase in freedom of access for those formerly excluded from the public has been met by a concomitant freedom for some, especially those with the financial means, to retreat from and co-opt the city for the ends of private enterprise. Thus, it is possible for significant segments of our society to live much of their lives in a *virtual* public space that is privately owned or controlled, including various forms of gated communities, Arcadian college campuses, and secured corporate enclaves. Urban design, across its ideological spectrum, has too often responded to this reality passively and with erroneous assumptions.

One such assumption is "If you build it, *they* will come"—following the credo that form may determine behavior, if one designs places that have the traditional trappings of urbanity, a public will appear to embrace them. Designers have, however, never conceptualized (or researched, statistically or sociologically) enough what "the public" is, not only what interests and avocations the ever-diversifying publics in our society might bring to urban spaces of communal assembly, celebration, and everyday accommodation, but also where these spaces may occur. Instead, whether it is balloon-holding children, Virgilian gazebo, main-street tropes of the neotraditionalists, or the bored, Prada-clad, night-of-the-living-dead flaneurs of OMA's