disciplinarity between the design disciplines.[2] On this topic Farshid Moussavi's call in the discussion "Urban Design Now" for greater interdisciplinarity and fluidity of identity within and between the design disciplines is timely and intelligent.

Another conclusion available from the material assembled here concerns the tendency within discussions of urban design to invoke an explicitly ethical or moral position, often to bolster support or claim a broad mandate for a specific point of view. Since architecture and landscape architecture have come to be increasingly driven by celebrity culture, the cultural capital it trades in, and the fetishized commodities it produces, urban design seems to have internalized a host of responsibilities and concerns historically housed within the professional practices themselves. The role of urban design as a conscience for the design disciplines is a perhaps predictable outcome, but it has the effect of charging many of the discussions surrounding urban design with multiple moral imperatives.

Most often these considerations are invoked around social and environmental subjects, asserting the responsibility of the design professional to consider and care for an increasingly hard-to-define set of publics. In the context of sustainability, these publics have been extended to include future generations of mobile global consumers, and the effect has been to render urban design as a moral high ground within an increasingly instrumentalized and bottom-line-driven global economy of and for design. Thus, one available reading of urban design today is that rather than offering the superdisciplinary platform for "urban-minded" architects and landscape architects envisioned by Sert, it affords a space for disciplinary subjects marginalized in the mainstream discourse of those fields. This recommends a reading of urban design as a superdisciplinary superego for subjects otherwise sublimated within the design professions.

Another more optimistic reading of the assembled material is available based on a point of general consensus. Urban design as an ongoing concern continues to enjoy a privileged academic authority and access to the empirical description of the built environment as a formal, cultural, or historical construct. This is no small strategic asset and should not be confused with planning's long-standing commitment to the description of policy, procedure, and public opinion. Rather, the historically literate empirical description of urban conditions and the best exemplars of built form are among the firmest foundations