

funding from Washington. So the same waves of ideas have flowed over the field as over the society, and urban designers have, across the years, taken up subjects perceived as relevant by those who produce the support. In the 1960s, the civil rights upheavals and the reaction against urban renewal paralleled each other. Protagonists of both movements joined in proclaiming urban design and architectural visions for renewing the city to be “part of the problem.” The social planners—social scientists in planning who became activists for social justice—criticized “the architect,” but in fact they were criticizing the only architects they met in their professional lives, those with planning training and others who, through their interest in cities, their practice in consultant firms or agencies, or their training, called themselves urban designers. The social planners accused them of designing large-scale architecture and calling it urban design; of lacking the socioeconomic and technical knowledge that urban design requires; of being naive about value systems and the complexities of multicultural societies; and of claiming to lead the planning team—and, in fact, of leading it, because they were better trained in coordination than other team members; and of leading it in wrong directions, based on their ignorance. Bacon was a prime example of what they were criticizing, and he was frequently their target.

Architects, by contrast, when they met this urban designer in a city planning department or urban renewal agency, called *him* (*sic*, advisedly) a “planner.” Finding themselves having to work within his design directives, they criticized him for not knowing enough about the design of buildings to make the guidelines realistic. In 1982, I summed up my experience as an architect and planner on both sides of this situation: “Lacking urban knowledge and architectural depth, urban designers fall between two stools; planners declare their prescriptions unrealistic and architects find their designs untalented.”<sup>16</sup>

Some urban designers responded to the social movements by assuming roles as advocates for the poor and the unrepresented in architecture and planning, but such roles could not support full-time careers.

The 1970s saw the beginning of twin trends: historical preservation and environmental sustainability. These have operated more or less in parallel in urban design ever since. They were, in turn, paralleled by Postmodernism in architecture and, nationally, by a sideslip toward Republicanism and Republican economics. Nixonism and Reaganism precipitated a flight from the public sector and public works,