

to housing, community development, local politics, and social movements. In this division of labor, Lewis Mumford and Jane Jacobs were on our side, not theirs.

I remained curious about this imposed separation, since I had always been interested in encouraging closer ties between all the spatial disciplines, from geography to architecture to urban and regional studies. Most of those who taught in urban planning's specialized area on the built environment had at least some architecture-related background and interests, while the faculty in the area of urban design (most of whom had strong European roots) seemed to have more interest in urban planning than other faculty in architecture. The two sides were clearly connected, and each occasionally addressed the need for greater cooperation and joint teaching with the other. Yet, something was keeping them apart.

I was repeatedly told that one of the reasons for this separation was the tendency for architecture, when administratively combined with urban planning at the university, to try to swallow up urban planning and redefine it in its own image, as occurred, it was claimed, in several major eastern universities. Some distancing and clear boundaries were necessary for survival and autonomy. But I soon discovered other reasons for the separation, especially when seen from my broader geographical perspective and in relation to my ongoing research and writing on the extraordinarily intense social and spatial restructuring taking place in Los Angeles.

The urban design I encountered at UCLA struck me as trapped in a scalar warp, an almost exclusively microspatial envisioning of the city that contrasted sharply with the planner's and geographer's perspective. Teaching urban design, I discovered, revolved heavily around what were called "typologies," idealized essences used to describe different urban forms through the composite style of buildings. This approach, exemplified in comparisons between ultramodernist Le Corbusier and more organic and earthy Frank Lloyd Wright, seemed to me to reduce the study of urban design (and the spatial morphology of cities) to little more than a superficial examination of the organization and appearances of bunches of buildings divorced from their larger urban and regional context. Whereas architects were concerned with individual buildings, urban designers dealt with bunches of buildings set in floating pods. The city itself, and especially the notion of urban morphology, appeared to be little more than an imagined aggregation of these small-scale forms, a simple