for the reconsideration of urban design as an ongoing concern. This admittedly modest circumference for the field could comfortably encompass Rodolfo Machado's reasoned and articulate call for "received knowledge" within the specific knowledge base of various design disciplines while equally accommodating Margaret Crawford's call for "everyday urbanism" and its implicit expectations of social justice through equitable description of urban community, identity, and lived experience.[3]

Unfortunately, far too much of urban design's relatively modest resources and attention have been directed in recent years toward arguably marginal concerns that read as increasingly vulnerable in contemporary urban culture. Among these, I will focus on three of the clearest and most vulnerable.

First, by far the most problematic aspect of urban design in recent years has been its tendency to be accommodating to the reactionary cultural politics and nostalgic sentiment of "New Urbanism." While leading design schools have tacked smartly in recent years to put some distance between themselves and the worst of this nineteenth-century pattern making, far too much of urban design practice apologizes for it by blessing its urban tenants at the expense of its architectonic aspirations. This most often comes in the form of overstating the environmental and social benefits of urban density while acknowledging the relative autonomy of architectural form. I would argue that urban design ought to concentrate less attention on mythic images of a lost golden age of density and more attention on the urban conditions where most of us live and work.

Second, far too much of the main body of mainstream urban design practice has been concerned with the crafting of "look and feel" of environments for destination consumption by the wealthy. About the ongoing consolidation of Manhattan as an enclave of wealth and privilege (largely facilitated through the best recent examples of urban design), New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg recently referred in a policy speech to New York as "a high-end product, maybe even a luxury product."[4] I would second Michael Sorkin's call for urban design to move beyond its implicit bias in favor of Manhattanism and its predisposition toward density and elitist enclaves explicitly understood as furnishings for luxury lifestyle. Finally, urban design's historic role of interlocutor between the design disciplines and planning has been too invested in public policy and process as a surrogate for the social. While the recent recuperation of urban planning