sense of, the structures through which I move. Drawn and reassured by vitality on the street, I come out to join that urban commerce, and thereby contribute my own presence to the city's life. The landscape features I pass become meaningful to me through their capacity to express cultural referents, whether local or foreign. And my determination to continue walking depends on how well the landscape responds to my flagging strength, my desire for shelter, my need for rest, and my wavering curiosity.

Because all these capacities to experience are combined in one beholder, the designer's task is that of integrating them, though perhaps still stressing one facet of the urban experience or another. So the integrative principle that each of our pioneering authors stresses should not be confused with principles of composition. Foremost among these principles of composition is *continuity.* As Bacon (1974) writes, "The purpose of design is to affect the people who use it, and in an architectural composition this effect is a continuous, unbroken flow of impressions that assault their senses as they move through it" (p. 18). Cullen (1961) stresses "serial vision as the urban designer's fundamental concern" (p. 11). Bacon (1974) goes so far as to make continuity of experience part of his definition of architecture. He declares in bold type that the architect's purpose in urban design is to define the urban participant's sequence of experiences. As we have seen here, that participant's experience of the city coheres according to several integrative principles, which can be understood separately or in combination. Nodes and enclosure, fine grain and ascent into space, mixed use and myth, permeability and relative proportion—guided by explicit integrative principles, the urban designer must compose across experiential domains to produce a continuity of experience.

The urban designer's task is distinct from that of the architect (one working on a single property) because form, legibility, vitality, meaning, and comfort each act on observers across property lines and across the public-private divide. In our market-driven world, our experience coheres—or fails to cohere—across space that is otherwise segmented by ownership, use rights, and admission criteria. Operating according to an impersonal and autonomous logic, real estate markets slice up and subdivide the urban environment into self-contained compartments, generating cities that are incoherent and fragmented. Urban designers' primary role is to respond to this economic fact by reasserting the cohesiveness of the urban experience.

In designing any particular place, we should be able to declare the integrative principles—whether form, legibility, vitality, meaning, comfort, or other principles (this article has not exhausted them)—through which we want to make the place cohere. While these principles do have an economic rationale, a planning theory drawn from conventional economics is starkly incapable of deriving such principles. And the organic tradition is too gross and undiscerning to serve as a good guide. We need a theory of planning through which designers can recognize experiential integrity and begin to rebuild the coherence of urban form.

Urban design as a field of planning

Working with ideas drawn from Karl Polanyi and the organicists, this article has presented an integrative theory of urban design, though in incipient and preliminary form. With proper elaboration, could it meet the five challenges listed at the beginning of this article? First, as we have seen, the theory does reveal that the seemingly divergent schools of urban design have in common a set of principles for reintegrating environments that would otherwise be fragmented by market commodification.

Second, the theory is substantive, not procedural. The questions of process that procedural planning theory addresses are nonetheless essential to planning practice. Skilled in integrative principles of form, vitality, etc., the urban designer must still make her way within the organizational contexts of professional practice, negotiate and resolve disagreements, muddle along within the constraints of human knowledge, grapple with complex ambiguities, survive in a world of power imbalances, and present ideas with rhetorical force (see Forester, 1989; Innes, 1998). Like other planners, urban designers must interact with communities and constituencies in formulating plans (see Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995). So planners, including urban designers, must still look to procedural theory, though it is an incomplete tradition in planning thought. Substantive theory is its essential complement; this article has presented one attempt at a substantive theory.

Despite its focus on urban design, the integrative theory presented here eschews the idea that the urban design subdiscipline is adequately circumscribed by concepts of space or physicality. After all, some kinds of space and most kinds of physical objects are very well allocated through market mechanisms. And several professional fields, including