

and design operations—from various procedures of ordination and subdivision, through replacement and renewal as well as conservation, to various contemporary forms of hybridization—all now have a place, but their appropriate application will require further discrimination and creative imagination. In short, global urbanization, especially when viewed from the vantage point of the possibility of becoming involved more globally and with more technical means at one's disposal, presents a greater array of issues for planning and design judgment than were often present in the past and certainly than were present in 1956.

Turning away from what is different to what today remains reasonably constant among the issues raised in the 1956 conference, several stand out, at least within contemporary professional rhetoric. First, there is the alleged recurrence of an “absence of beauty and delight in contemporary cities.”¹¹ This, after all, was one of the main bones of contention in 1956 and remains a professional, and, at times, political longing today. Without wishing to duck the issue entirely or put undue stress on the notion that beauty is in the eye of the beholder, one must note that this complaint is hardly new now, nor was it in 1956. There is ample evidence to suggest that the elite powers that be in well-mannered situations, like those in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Italy, were not thrilled by developments in the *borghi*—suburban developments—outside their walls. Further back, much the same could be said of the Romans, and moving forward, it is not as if the fetid slums of London, Paris, and New York were not frowned upon by professional and political elites of their time.

The more interesting aspect of those reactions is that they were then, as now, oddly, both conservative and reformatory—conservative insofar as they embraced considerable protection for the urban appearance of a particular way of life, and reformatory because, at the same time, this attitude was engaged by a sufficient enough consensus as a positive way forward. Whether it was or not is another matter. Moreover, the projection of such attitudes often had a bias toward invidious comparisons backward in time when matters of urban expression were presumed to be better, more stable, more thoroughgoing, or more intelligible. At least in this last regard, of course they were, given the creatively faulty or incomplete process of recall usually involved. Certainly newness, novelty, and eschewing aspects of the past also played a role in the pursuit of urban beauty. Indeed, most urban projections were publicly sold on some promise of being different