

## acknowledgements

An editing project of this magnitude is always to some extent an educational venture for an editor who isn't a specialist in the field. *Urban Issue: Urban Issues* has been in our plans for quite a number of years now, and I think I have learned a great deal. Most of it I learned from reading the quite considerable number of urban articles submitted to the journal in that time. Many, of course, were not felt by our editorial consultants to be suitable for publication in our journal, but, to tell the truth, I don't recall a bad article among them. Some were too specialized; a couple were essentially editorials, arguing for tactics which they urged reform-minded people to take in working to ameliorate certain urban conditions; one or two, our consultants felt, reached conclusions too ambitious for their data. But one could learn from them all, and I hope I did. Let me thank first, then, all those who responded to the announcement of this issue by sending us manuscripts to consider.

An even larger debt is owed to the authors of the accepted articles, because we have been very finicky in dealing with even those manuscripts about which we were most enthusiastic. In order to make *Urban Issue: Urban Issues* more nearly a symposium and less a random collection of articles which deal one way or another with cities, we have asked for all manner of revisions, sometimes urging authors to consider matters which they had not planned to discuss because we felt that the work they had done had implications for the work which other of our authors were doing.

Contributors to this issue also had to put up with your editor's fussy feelings about style. It seems to him that if an interdisciplinary symposium is going to be genuinely successful, its results have to be fully comprehensible to all participants. And this means that those who habitually write in an in-group language—which, while perfectly understood by other geographers, sociologists, urban planners, or whatever, may be incomprehensible or totally unattractive to a reader who deals, say, in the history of ideas—were asked to revise, restate, explain, define and so forth. This is a lot to ask; we're grateful for their patience, and hope that the result is worth the effort. We very much want the reader who is not technically oriented to read even the most technical of these articles, and hope we have made them comprehensible and attractive.

Two people deserve special thanks for unusual services performed: Tom Johnson, who, knowing we were at work on the issue, scouted up a good article for us, and Robert Nunley, who, to extend a not overly-original metaphor, did some editorial pinch-hitting in the twelfth inning or so and delivered.

The deepest debt is owed to John Hancock, who suggested the idea for this issue at least six or seven years ago. The idea was discussed and approved at an editorial/executive board meeting, and real action began about two and a half years ago. Many of the articles in this issue were solicited by Professor Hancock; he acted as one of our editorial readers on every one of them. John deserves credit, in short, for the conception and a good deal of the execution of this special number.