

together into urban design to get a *total picture* of our physical environment by *integration* of those efforts. . . . I know it's difficult to talk about teamwork in our times because we are living through a period of a cult of the individual and the genius, but with all due respect to genius[es], it is not to them that we owe our best cities. They are rather the production of honest anonymous crews. In terms of urban design, the best cities are the most harmonious; those that have greater unity and balance in their different parts. Scale and the knowledge of scale is the key to this balanced effect which is much more important for a city than to have striking isolated monuments that are the expressions of a genius.¹⁴ [emphasis mine]

This presents an essentially *aesthetic* measure of urban success. Synthesis of professional disciplines seems to have been a major element of Sert's aspirations for urban design. Indeed, it is remarkable that at its genesis the discussion on urban design included representatives from architecture, planning, and landscape architecture. There was a coming together, if not yet fully a "common ground," around which the "professions" dealt with the challenge of defining the roles that design professionals could play in city making. The conference proceedings reveal an equal concern for the idea of urban design from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds. Further, there appeared to be general agreement with the diagnosis that the city required radical change and that the "professions" needed to be retooled to address these problems. By 1960 one could see that very little in the way of "on-the-ground" urban change resulted from this resolve.

Another preoccupation at the conference that has relevance for the contemporary situation was a discussion on "forces that are shaping cities today." This discussion seems to have generated considerable debate among the participants. Remarkably relevant to the present, the discussion for the most part deals with the relative weakness of design professions to influence outcomes in the making of the city. Lloyd Rodwin (founder of the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies with Martin Meyerson in 1959) described the essential problem that "architects, planners, and landscape architects rank among the least important of the forces [shaping cities]."¹⁵

This statement is fascinating for several reasons. Again it speaks to the perennial issue of defining the design professional's role in urban design, and indeed Rodwin is calling into question the very possibility of urban design. So from the start, urban design suffered