tions of planners, yet it spanned from economic and systems planning to global and social concerns, and it covered a theme that was to become major for Venturi and me: the place of communication in architecture and urbanism.

Crane had imported from Harvard the notion of "determinants of urban form" and started me researching social, economic, technological, and natural forces as conditioners of urban settlement patterns. In 1961, he had me write "Meaningful City," my first attempt at understanding urban symbolism and communication.[20] His response to the generalities of Athens Charter urbanism was to turn attention to urban "tissue," meaning the parts of the city that lie between its major circulation routes and its largest public facilities. He thought that urban designers, if they were to orchestrate the building decisions of the "thousand designers," should understand the common building types within that tissue, the city's "thematic units" (for example, the row house in Philadelphia) and the new types that were emerging (regional shopping centers in the 1950s).

Crane studied the relation between public and private in the city (how, for example, housing could be built only where urban infrastructure was provided) and considered whether such relationships could be used as a source of guidance of private city building. From this he evolved the notion of the "capital web," by which he meant the total of all public building and public works in the city, including the circulation system. Because it contained about half the built volume of the city, this system could, he thought, be designed to serve as a framework and guide for private building.

Pushed by the visible problems of urban change in the 1950s, Crane thought philosophically about cycles of renewal in the city over time. He brought to our attention Kevin Lynch's discussion on whether there could be a means of planning that would allow urban change to cause less hardship than it was causing. In particular, Lynch showed how physical change can indeed be planned for—even though its extent and detail cannot be predicted—and he listed several methods of doing this.[21]

These ideas, outlined in two seminal articles by Crane in 1960,[22] were a signpost to those of us who saw our roles as spanning architecture and planning—and this at a time when most urban design education was a form of architectural navel-contemplation: given to architects by architects about architecture. Crane grappled with the difficult and prickly material of the urban social sciences and systems