

Harvard debate? Walter Gropius, Martin Wagner, John Brinkerhoff Jackson, Louis I. Kahn, William Wheaton, Robert B. Mitchell, Martin Myerson, Walter Isard, Britton Harris, John Dyckman, Kevin Lynch, Jacqueline Tyrwhitt (who, in fact, attended and documented the proceedings), David Crane, Herbert Gans, Paul Kriesis, Melvin Webber, Paul Davidoff, and Harvard-related, but perhaps not apposite, Philip Johnson. Also, where were the latter-day Europeans, the Brutalists, and Team 10?

From today's viewpoint, what topics were missing? One was the critique of late orthodox Modern architecture that was in full swing in Europe and beginning in America. The Brutalists and Team 10 had posed the life of urban streets and the complexities of traditional and primitive urban forms (of "architecture without architects") against the simplicities of the *Ville Radieuse*. Their revolt was particularly against the latter-day CIAM, which Sert represented and which they felt had lost its spark. Therefore, they were unlikely to be influential at Harvard. Another topic was globalism. Central now, it was also central to the experience of some conference members, who practiced internationally, but it was mentioned only by Abrams.¹⁵ Still another topic was education. Harvard probably formulated the studios that Crane taught at Penn. These provided the format, but not the content, for my studio teaching in urban design, planning, and architecture.

The Harvard pedagogical model—based on Gropius's Bauhaus-derived ideas, CIAM's urban-centric view of architecture, and, via Sert, the views of urbanists present at the conference—was present in architecture and planning education at Penn in the late 1950s, but of growing importance was the school of planning at the University of Chicago. Their churlish social scientists could hardly give architects the time of day, yet their thinking played a galvanizing role in my education. It would be interesting to compare the debate at Harvard in 1956 with one held at Penn in 1960, during a faculty retreat called to reconsider the curriculum of the planning department. The Penn planners' enthusiasm for the urban future was more muted, coming four years later and from a group of, in-the-main, social sciences-based planners.

Urban Design, Then Till Now

What has happened since 1956? Urban design, like all fields, follows trends and fashions and is pushed by available resources, particularly