

might have some authority over to a limitation to only those things that design professionals have control over. It is in this reduction that we begin to understand urban design's inherent contradiction: the acknowledgement that the city is complex and that urban design must "retool" itself to deal with such complexity and a simultaneous acknowledgement of the limitations of professional authority and a reduction to simplify the terms of urban design's engagement to within the known authority of the profession. The first conference made a territorial claim over the city and acknowledged the issue of having to "retool" the design professional to be able to grasp and influence this territory. So from the very start there was an appreciation for the design professional's limitations. By the second conference, however, the issue of complexity is dropped to achieve simplicity. Ever since then, urban design has struggled to come to terms with the complexity of urban situations, and these issues of authority, control, and territory have become fundamental to the problem of definition. In the second conference, the issue of "common ground" was raised several times, but it was clearly being tabled to assert a territorial positioning of the design professions in relation to territory clearly controlled by planners and others. It is here we have a sense of the struggle of the architects and their attempt to take back, as it were, the city from the authority of the planners. What is interesting in the comparison of the first and second conferences is that whereas in the first conference one can appreciate searching and exploring for boundaries, in the second a much clearer but narrowing set of boundaries is being assumed, as if the terms of the engagement were being drawn.

By the Third Urban Design Conference in April 1959, the terms of urban design seem to have been sufficiently developed so that the first case study of projects was attempted. What is interesting is that there do not seem to be any conclusions or set of principles from this conference ever published, and the criteria for choosing the case studies are not explained in any conference material. Interestingly, the architectural focus of the discussions reinforces a further separation from planning issues, but what is also evident in the subject matter and the people attending is the diminution of landscape architecture's influence as well—landscape was not discussed in the case studies. This obvious lack marks a fundamental shift from the previous two conferences and would set the tone for all subsequent conferences. The "common ground" in which architecture, landscape architecture,