

from past practices and somehow addressing new realities. Both the City Beautiful movement and Olmsted's park plans had this aspect to them. Again whether they were or not is another matter. Nevertheless, when projections were generally perceived to be overly involved with novelty, newness, and contemporaneity, they were, more often than not, rather quickly set aside or, after a short life, repudiated for failing to meet expectations, usually with respect to connections with some aspect of the past. Certainly these sentiments seem to have befallen public housing in the United States and elsewhere.

Readily agreed-on lasting instances of beauty and delight, as far as urban landscapes are concerned, seem to occur most readily around moments of extraordinary creative insight and civic responsibility exercised by powerful elites. Here, Sixtus V comes to mind. Or they occur at times during which culturally well-sedimented but relatively limited building practices were given full expressive rein. Here, the *sibeyuan* and *hutong* arrangements of everyday imperial China come to mind. Clearly, these situations of common and lasting agreement leave much that lies, or could lie, in between. This recognition, however, does not rule out less readily agreed-on instances of lasting beauty and delight, especially those that might be expected in today's pluralistic environments and poststructuralist frame of mind. Nor does it rule out working in the direction of more widely and readily accepted agreements. If anything, the problem with the position taken in 1956 was that it held out for a solution based on broad bundling together of disciplinary perspectives, whereas world history seems to suggest that a well-placed particularity of expressive viewpoint or a focusing of familiar means is more likely to produce the desired effects.

A second issue in common with at least some contemporary professional rhetoric is the danger of rampant real estate entrepreneurship, variously described in 1956 as resulting in "useful but vulgar improvements" and a "profit system [that] exacts its price for the other values it produces," namely, through a paucity in the urban environments created.¹² Clearly, if left unattended, such an entrepreneurial orientation is indeed a clear and present danger. However, rarely is this quite as possible in many parts of the world as it might have been in the past. Governmental oversight and the institutional complexity surrounding urbanization, including market transactions, have increased in many places, even leading to rumblings about overregulation and abuse by members of the real estate industry. Conversely, centralized