
White Cities, Linguistic Turns, and Disneylands: The New Paradigms of Urban History

Author(s): Timothy J. Gilfoyle

Source: *Reviews in American History*, Vol. 26, No. 1, The Challenge of American History (Mar., 1998), pp. 175-204

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30030879>

Accessed: 04-05-2015 16:45 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Reviews in American History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

WHITE CITIES, LINGUISTIC TURNS, AND DISNEYLANDS: THE NEW PARADIGMS OF URBAN HISTORY

Timothy J. Gilfoyle

Few events better illustrate the multiple paradigms in recent urban history than the World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 in Chicago. For decades, the considerable literature on the Fair emphasized the "White City" and issues of physical planning, moral order, and neoclassical architecture. But since 1980, the Exposition has exemplified the growing diversity of urban historiography.¹ For Christine Boyer, the Fair was part of a new discourse reflecting the emergence of modern urban planning. By contrast, Stanley Schultz characterizes the Exposition not as a beginning, but the culmination of the city planning ethos of the nineteenth century. William Cronon invokes the event as a metaphor for the "shock city" of industrial America, "a fantasy landscape," and "a fairy city" symbolizing Chicago's historic climax. Alan Trachtenberg and Wim de Wit underscore nationalism, viewing the Fair as a "grand illusion" by American rulers "to win hegemony over the emerging national culture." Peter Hales, by comparison, emphasizes urban culture, with an elite seeking "control over the production of the urban vision." Most critical is Robert Rydell, who sees the White City as "a cultural Frankenstein," "a coin minted in the tradition of American racism."²

Numerous narratives now emphasize the Midway over the White City. John Kasson cast the first stone in this direction, arguing that the Midway represented a new model of democratic urban recreation shaped not by the civic beliefs of cultural elites but by the commercial values of entrepreneurs seeking to attract a mass audience. A host of historians conclude that the Midway's architecture and leisure environment was constructed as imagined and commodified "representations of exotic culture."³

In essence, the Columbian Exposition is an interpretive smorgasbord. For urban historians, the Fair represents a metaphor for elite and plebeian values, a symbol of leisure and commercial cultures, the industrial city at its apogee, the physical embodiment of racial, ethnic, class and gender conflict, the beginning and the end of nineteenth-century planning, and the very essence of nineteenth-century American nationalism.

The multiple and perplexing views of this one event are emblematic of the

Reviews in American History 26 (1998) 175-204 © 1998 by The Johns Hopkins University Press

interpretive confusion marking urban history since 1980. The inclusion of topics ranging from cultural representations of cities found in fiction to empirical studies of the built environment fractured an already splintered and internally divided field. Some, like Stephan Thernstrom who helped invent the nomenclature "new urban history," even abandoned the label "urban" altogether.⁴

Rejecting the category of "urban," however, does not justify ignoring cities. Intellectual identity crises and scholarly pessimism are hardly unique to urban history. Most subfields of history are susceptible to such charges. Western, diplomatic and intellectual history, for example, recently generated debates over their meaning or utility. Practitioners of cultural studies openly concede the impossibility of defining their field.⁵ Scholars will probably always contest the meaning of "urban" and "city." By now, the debate is pointless.⁶

For most urbanists, the definition is quite simple. People identify cities as places; what happens in those places is considered "urban." Undoubtedly, such a broad, imprecise definition raises howls of protest in some academic quarters. Yet, recent urban history with its multiple paradigms and conflicting interpretations is a reaction to the narrow methodologies of the "new urban history" of the 1960s and 1970s. Sophisticated studies like Theodore Hershberg's Philadelphia Social History Project precisely analyzed space and certain social behaviors, but effectively excluded architecture, politics, gender, and culture.⁷ These themes constitute the bulk of recent urban scholarship. Most significant has been the application of "culture" as an interpretive paradigm, influencing not only studies of social groups but also examinations of the built environment, regionalism, and suburbanization. Even institutional approaches to urban political history, which have turned old paradigms upside down, represent a reaction to cultural methodologies and questions.

Urban Cultures

Since 1980, historians of urban social groups have largely abandoned "modernization" and Marxism for the subcultural theories of sociologist Claude S. Fischer and anthropologist Clifford Geertz.⁸ From Italians in the tenements of Elizabeth Street to Jews and Mexicans in the bungalows of Los Angeles, historians emphasize the persistence and adaptability of premigration cultures over time. Migrant groups shaped and controlled their lives, even within the harsh economic, spatial and social limits of the dominant culture. Vastly different kinds of migrants were active agents in choosing among different courses of action, not simply subjects of social control. Rather than

positing a picture of complete assimilation or ongoing ethnic/racial persistence, historians now see the process as an ongoing blend of both over time.⁹

Much of the literature on migrant groups details the "construction" of certain social identities. Whereas labor historians frequently locate the source of class consciousness in the workplace, urbanists emphasize domestic and leisure activities. In the nineteenth century, for example, male working-class identities were defined by neighborhood networks, street gangs, and saloons.¹⁰ Antebellum elites and Protestant institutions physically separated themselves by constructing "patches of elegance" in their neighborhoods—renaming specific blocks, planting trees, and erecting picket fences to physically extend the domestic space outward. Geography became equated with gentility.¹¹ Likewise, examinations of fashion, "style," and dress explain the plasticity of urban classes. Migrants, while dressing better than in their former societies, used clothing for symbolic and self-identifying purposes. In her detailed examination of five working-class communities in twentieth-century Chicago, Lizabeth Cohen found older ethnic identities subverted by patterns of mass consumption and class consciousness.¹²

Applications of anthropological theory further highlight a "discourse of the street."¹³ Rituals and customs which intersect with or exploit part of the built environment illustrate how different groups manipulated public streets in cities for their own use: antebellum women in New York, paraders in nineteenth-century Philadelphia, street children at the turn of the century, African-Americans in the segregated South.¹⁴ Studies on urban Catholicism, in particular, increasingly emphasize its territorial character. The high rates of white ethnic home ownership, a sacralized attachment to residential property and the neighborhood, devotional Catholicism and the centrality of the ethnic parish in daily life generated a community identity emotionally linked to physical locale.¹⁵

The strength of many case studies lies in revealing the internal complexity of urban communities. Studies of urban blacks, for example, expose highly differentiated neighborhoods divided by class, gender, culture, and especially religion. Historians have more closely scrutinized the migration to northern cities in the twentieth century and its polarizing impact. The focus on local communities and internal subcultures even complicates interpretations of the civil rights movement, suggesting that many different *movements*, not a single national crusade, characterized this phenomenon.¹⁶

The "thick descriptions" of various working-class groups and their social identities has inadvertently overturned the "textile" and "Coketown" paradigms of the industrial city.¹⁷ Variated models stretching from Lowell to Los Angeles have replaced older, linear theories of industrialization. Although Sean Wilentz's theory of "metropolitan industrialization" attracted the most

attention, other historians have found a complex, multifaceted, even pluralistic evolution of industrial capitalism. The industrialization of certain sectors, such as shipping, generated distinctive urban forms for different cities. Paradoxically, the bulk of this scholarship originated largely from examinations of labor, not capital.¹⁸

Gender studies further complicate this fragmented picture. Examinations of women, for example, emphasize their associational, sexual, and work behaviors. While many of those activities afforded autonomy and venues of public life unknown to rural counterparts, women often remained divided by class, racial, religious, and other identities—conclusions mirroring investigations of ethnic and racial groups.¹⁹ Anxiety over the status and behavior of young men and women was especially acute in the urban industrial environment of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Urban reformers and public authorities, rather than addressing the economic roots of the vulnerability of single women, usually problematized women's sexual behavior and transformed it into a "moral" crisis demanding aggressive intervention.²⁰

Other historians have examined the subjects of such aggressive intervention. For single women, gay men, lesbian couples, and others, certain city neighborhoods provided unprecedented opportunities to escape the traditional controls of family and community, allowing them to become partially autonomous actors in the market. Wage labor, although arduous and poorly paid, gave many young women and men an independent income, effectively buying a measure of freedom from family dependence. The centers of commercialized leisure—dance halls, movie theaters, amusement parks—provided a relatively unregulated, cash-based, social arena for young men and women in the hours between work shifts. By developing new habits of dress, speech, and entertainment, urban youths created a variety of distinctive urban subcultures. Studies of sexual behavior have uncovered a complexity of communities ranging from prostitutes to homosexuals.²¹ Groups and activities long deemed geographically segregated, socially marginalized, or imperceptible were visible, public actors, especially within the context of their spatial impact.

This body of literature raises a new interpretation of popular culture. The era from 1890 to 1950 was one of civic sociability and democratized urban leisure. The vaudeville houses, cabarets, movie palaces, baseball fields, amusement parks, department stores and world's fair midways offered a "something for everybody" philosophy that appealed to fantasy and consumption. The crowded venues, spectacular displays, and sophisticated styles epitomized not only a new urban culture, but modernity itself. The cumulative effect of these "cultural bazaars" was a "democratic" subversion of Victorian gender, ethnic and class boundaries. A variety of urbanites—gay males, single women, entertainers, "sporting men"—carved out spheres of

participation. In many cases, local politicians were key participants in the protection and development of these new forms of leisure. The rise of the shopping mall, automobile, theme park and suburban sports stadium after World War II ultimately destroyed this world.²²

The emphasis in popular cultures, especially the subversive and surreal worlds of "nightlife," broadened urban history to include an almost infinite variety of subcultures. For the first time, historians revealed how certain marginalized groups not only created their own communities but appropriated and contested the use of urban space. Indeed, the worlds of the hobo and homosexual, the prostitute and panderer, become core fixtures of American social life, and Times Square its epicenter.²³

Unfortunately, the focus of this literature is "Gothamcentric." New York City not only dominates these narratives; some proclaim Gotham the embodiment of modernity. But "modernity" is a slippery term. Many of the same fantastic images and social themes appear elsewhere. Some locate the birthplace of modernism in Los Angeles with the architecture of R.M. Schindler and Richard Neutra. Elsewhere, Chicago is represented as a place of industrial might, skyscrapers, and progress. The city possessed a vigorous bohemian and "modernist" subculture. Chicago's Century of Progress Exposition of 1933 preceded New York's World's Fair of 1939. Using Chicago's Great Fire, Haymarket incident and Pullman strike as representative events, Carl Smith argues that *disorder*—especially class disorder—epitomized the new metropolis, representing the "vocabulary of the formative period of modernism."²⁴

While popular culture transgressed or muted class, ethnic, and gender boundaries, historians examining neighborhoods find greater racial divides. Even studies that distinguish between southern and northern black neighborhoods—the former being "separate cities" of self-contained communities, the latter dependent ghettos—conclude that each prototype became a larger and poorer enclave. Some, like Roger Lane, insist that decades of residential segregation, social discrimination, industrial exclusion, and economic insecurity generated a criminal culture within African-American northern neighborhoods that detrimentally affected all residents of that community.²⁵ Others point to structural factors and racism. Some examinations even document the emergence of a black "urban underclass" in the twentieth century, a term largely rejected by urban historians and sociologists because of its fluid, ambiguous meaning.²⁶

The precise evolution and relationships among these urban cultures remain unresolved. Most recent scholarship adheres to Lawrence Levine's depiction of American urban culture as fluid and divided, replete with ethnic, class, and regional differences. The shared variety of city cultures, especially in the first half of the nineteenth century, was less hierarchically organized and more fragmented than a century later. Yet others push the clock back on

cultural homogenization. Richard Bushman insists that late-eighteenth- and nineteenth-century urban elites commercialized aristocratic, European notions of "refinement" and gentility. By 1850, they were sources of middle-class identity. Culture may percolate up from below, producing a contentious, dialectical relationship between high and low, elite and plebeian, native and immigrant cultures. But for Bushman, power exercises influence, and those "at the top have an immense advantage in influencing cultural power."²⁷

The emphasis on culture, particularly the dynamism of subcultures, has contributed to a convergence of architectural, social, and cultural history.²⁸ Here the locus of urban culture is defined not by leisure, work, or ethnic cultures, but by the manipulation of landscapes and built environments. The nineteenth-century park and cemetery movements reflected not only new physical forms, for example, but conflicting urban cultures with their own political and social ideologies. Nineteenth-century changes in law, technology, health care, and even urban novels (or "urbtopian" fiction) epitomized a new urban culture, a "moral environmentalism" beholden to technology as society's savior and to planning to insure urban order.²⁹ Even studies of company towns divulge a complexity of moral visions and physical forms—ranging from Christian socialism to welfare capitalism to corporate paternalism—stretching from the mill towns of New England to Torrance, California.³⁰

Studies of skyscrapers reflect a new interest in their cultural meaning and social impact. Few now debate who or what city "invented" the skyscraper, recognizing that the tall building was an evolutionary product rather than a specific discovery. Instead, tall building controversies at the turn of the century reveal a variety of cultural conflicts. New York builders sought unregulated commercial expansion and an architecture advertising wealth and prestige. Boston and Chicago, by contrast, frustrated skyscraper construction by adopting strict height regulations in order to emphasize and imitate European aesthetics. The earliest skyscrapers, once disdained by modernists for hiding internal structures, now win appreciation for providing "cultivated" work environments and historical links to the past.³¹ Still others, notably Carol Willis, argue that the skyscraper is a product of money, speculation, prestige, and technology, not aesthetic theories of form. Questions of construction technology, internal mechanics, and finance rendered the engineer's contribution to tall buildings essential, the architect's superficial.³²

Housing remains the most examined building form, in part because residential designs illuminate ideologies of gender, class, and race. Cooperative housekeeping designs by nineteenth-century "material feminists," for example, represent little-remembered alternatives to privatized domesticity. The apartment house and its association with modernity was a key ingredient of urban middle-class identity, even if only a minority ever resided in them. In New York, the emergence of new forms of residential architecture, namely the

tenement, reflected the transformation of the nation's largest metropolis into a city of working-class renters.³³ Nationwide, home ownership rates proved surprisingly high in immigrant and working-class communities, provoking a debate over the utility of working-class home ownership. Paradoxically, Americans displayed high levels of residential mobility which continued well into the twentieth century. Only the housing programs after 1933 changed this, cementing Franklin Roosevelt's vision of a modern social compact dependent upon a residentially-stable citizenry.³⁴

Housing represents a key linkage between African-American and urban history. By the mid-twentieth century, white ethnic communities in numerous cities violently resisted demands for adequate housing by expanding African-American populations. In Chicago alone, Arnold Hirsch discovered nearly 500 "communal riots"—violent, racial incidents from 1945 to 1950 largely unreported by the media. Herein lay the origins of the "new American ghetto" or "hyperghettoes." Between 1940 and 1970, a government-sanctioned "second ghetto" with a distinctive form of *de jure* segregation emerged, supported by white ethnics defending their "homeowner rights" and downtown elites striving to preserve commercial real estate.³⁵

Racial conflicts over housing raise several interpretive issues. First, the forces contributing to the "urban crisis," deindustrialization, and the emergence of "Reagan Democrats" originated in local resistance to racial integration *before* the antipoverty programs of the Great Society in the 1960s.³⁶ Second, neighborhood-based violence over housing illuminates the emergence of "whiteness" and racially-constructed identities among various ethnic groups.³⁷ Finally, that same violence beckons for more nuanced interpretations of urban riots and rebellions, a literature which frequently construes crowd behavior as a rational, extralegal—even legitimate—vehicle of protest by powerless groups.³⁸

Other students of the built environment treat urban technologies as the material embodiment of people's values and culture. Joel Tarr, Josef Konvitz and others focus on "technological networks"—roads, bridges, water and sewer systems, disposal facilities, power grids, transit and communication structures—and their environmental impact.³⁹ Some even redefine long-held assumptions in urban history. For example, nineteenth-century nuisance regulations and rat control programs in the twentieth century alter the standard chronology of municipal politics. Women reformers, acting as "municipal housekeepers" after 1890, used environmental issues like smoke abatement to affect public policy and generate reform movements. Pollution concerns and water fluoridation in industrial cities like Gary, Indiana transformed conservative, middle-class women into liberal political activists after 1950, turning the environmental movement into a woman's movement. Studies of utility executives such as Samuel Insull in Chicago and Henry

Doherty in Denver go beyond their consolidation efforts to explain their advocacy of new forms of urban consumption, modernity, and labor saving technology. Treating cities as ecological systems even redefines where urban history begins; the origins of St. Louis lie not with the European settlement of 1701, but with the Indian city of Cahokia in the tenth century.⁴⁰

Paradoxically, this literature both corroborates and refutes Sam Bass Warner, Jr.'s theory of privatism.⁴¹ In nineteenth-century Chicago, physical improvements were the responsibility of individual property owners or private development companies. Private real estate forces thus dominated municipal government, excluding propertyless citizens and delaying the construction of streets, sidewalks, and sewers. Ironically, working-class Pullman and Harvey enjoyed better streets, sewers, and gas than the more affluent Wicker Park. Even residents in older New England communities demanded more and better services as cities grew larger, but refused to pay for them. When municipalities assumed such responsibilities at the turn of the twentieth century, "reformers" created less-representative political bodies—commissions, special districts, city manager governments, strong-mayor systems, at-large councils—to insure efficient delivery of services.⁴²

At the same time, political action preceded infrastructure improvements. Even middle-class residents organized, petitioned, and fought for physical improvements. Hence, historians increasingly question Warner's contention that transportation technology triggered urban growth. Urban transit networks actually followed the settlement of newly developed neighborhoods.⁴³

The largest and most expensive infrastructure—the interstate highway—has generated several studies on the impact of the automobile. Within the first quarter of the twentieth century, a new social order was imposed on urban streetlife. Streets were increasingly reserved for vehicular traffic, terminating their use as playgrounds for children, markets for peddlers and consumers, and open-air churches for pilgrims or sexual emporiums for prostitutes. Automobiles also furthered the deterioration of mass transit systems. Here, Americans held contradictory attitudes, blaming automobile manufacturers for the decline of urban transit systems (a myth perpetuated in the popular movie *Roger Rabbit*) while simultaneously regarding the car as the epitome of freedom. Most historians now reject arguments that automobile interests insidiously conspired to destroy urban mass transit systems. In Los Angeles, for example, residents abandoned streetcars for autos and transit companies replaced streetcars with motor buses in the 1920s, long before General Motors stepped on stage.⁴⁴

Regions and Suburbs

Like many ordinary Americans, urban historians have engaged in a regional shift. The American West has replaced the Midwest and East Coast as the

centerpoint of many urban narratives. Southern California epitomized this demographic and historiographical transformation. A postwar "megapolis," the region contained communities like Irvine identified as "spread cities," "technoburbs," "edge cities," "disurbs," or "post-suburbs" which were not traditional cities or suburbs. Rather, they possessed attributes of both. The prominence of this regional form inspired new theoretical approaches to the study of cities while inducing others to redefine the field as "metropolitan history."⁴⁵

This new regionalist paradigm is illustrated in the diverse works of Roger Lotchin and Kevin Starr. The former argues that a "metropolitan-military complex" dating to the 1920s generated intense intercity rivalries that proved more influential than industrialization in creating of one of the world's dominant urban regions.⁴⁶ By contrast, Starr offers a detailed narrative of the urbanization process, although his voluminous writings focus on the entire state of California. Both authors resist the case-study microhistory typical of recent urban history, thereby providing long-term, comparative studies of twentieth-century urban systems and networks.⁴⁷

Reinterpretations of Western history increasingly highlight the region's urban character. As early as 1880, the West was more urban than the rest of the U.S. (30 versus 28 percent). Several themes stand out. First, the study of western cities has shifted from "frontier" questions to issues concerning ecology, urbanity, and the metropolitan periphery. The "history of the frontier West," admits William Cronon, is "a story of peripheral areas becoming ever more integrated into an urban-industrial economy."⁴⁸ Second, the diversity of individual cities is comprehensible only by regional comparisons of urban systems, thereby emphasizing interactions among towns and cities. Anthony Orum's comparison of Milwaukee, Cleveland, Austin, and Minneapolis-St. Paul found similar patterns of growth in their early histories before factors independent to each city caused them to diverge in the twentieth century.⁴⁹ Finally, Western metropolitan expansion rarely imitated Eastern competitors. The history of twentieth-century "sunbelt cities" in both the West and South witnessed business-dominated politics, hostility to organized labor, suburban spatial form, and federally-subsidized growth.⁵⁰

Distinctive, regional patterns of urbanization similarly apply to the South. David Goldfield maintains that southern city building was "urbanization without cities." Even after four centuries, southern cities remained closer in spirit to antebellum plantations than their northern counterparts. Similarly, Carl Abbott finds that while transportation and communication systems integrated Washington, D.C. into regional networks of the Northeast, the city's southern character grew more pronounced. "Modernizing without northernizing," Washington's history challenges interpretations of regional culture as a form of resistance to the homogenizing and hegemonic forces of

globalization.⁵¹ Others like Don Doyle disagree, pointing out that the post-Civil War South increasingly replicated the North with growing boosterism, physical infrastructures, planned suburbs, new and dominating business elites, and the emergence of an urban network of southern cities.⁵²

The most studied of regional forms is suburbanization. By some measures, twentieth-century American urbanization is suburbanization. Kenneth T. Jackson and Robert Fishman, in particular, argue that the "automobile suburb" differed from anything else in the urban world in its lower density and larger average lot size. The physical impact was considerable: the rise of the residential subdivision with one-story and ranch-style houses, the disappearance of the porch, the growth of an entirely new vernacular architecture—the shopping mall, the motel, the gas station, the drive-in theater, the mobile home. Since 1950, cities like Baltimore, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, Detroit, Cleveland, and St. Louis lost between 22 and 50 percent of their populations. Cities that grew—Dallas, Houston, Phoenix, San Diego—did so largely through annexation.⁵³ By 1970, most Americans lived in suburbs, not cities or rural areas.

Some theorists still argue that suburbs or "multinucleated metropolitan regions" represent new forms of urban space.⁵⁴ Historians, however, locate suburbs in the distant past, tracing their origins and ideological roots to European romanticism and British town planning.⁵⁵ Suburbs, alongside the pioneering landscape designs found in cemeteries and parks, embodied a key element of American romanticism. Indeed, efforts to incorporate nature into city life distinguished American suburban design well into the twentieth century.⁵⁶

Historians increasingly argue that cultural values favoring rural living propelled the growth of suburbs. Developers and planners simply followed popular currents and used their trade to satisfy demand. Similarly, historians of gender find postwar suburbanization a key component in the evolution of domesticity and the social construction of masculine and feminine identities.⁵⁷

This suburban paradigm has come under recent attack. Some insist that movement to the periphery was a feature of American cities before highways and autos. Suburbs were less homogeneous than described, often developing as satellite cities with diverse and mixed populations. Recent studies of "self-building" in Detroit and Toronto even found working-class residents, immigrants, and minorities settling on the undeveloped fringe. Herbert Gans, in particular, argues that social distinctions between cities and suburbs are often more artificial than real, that inner-city neighborhoods, or "urban villages," can be as socially detached and isolated as suburbs.⁵⁸

Portions of these disputes are definitional. Suburbs represent a physical form neither urban or rural, but something in-between, a problem in a field with no agreed upon definition of "urban." Indeed, some suburbs began as

outlying villages and evolved into inner-city neighborhoods: Harlem and Brooklyn Heights in New York, Old Irving Park in Chicago, and Country Club Plaza in Kansas City. Postwar suburbs have assumed a confusing variety of labels such as "multinucleated metropolitan regions," technoburbs," and "edge cities." Just as sociologists like Louis Wirth argued that urbanism was a way of life, some suggest the same of postwar suburbs.⁵⁹

In fact, historians like Jackson, Fishman, and others do not deny the diversity and difficulty of defining suburbs, illustrated by such differing communities as East St. Louis and Winnetka, Illinois. In the nineteenth century, railroad suburbs had *both* rich and poor, sometimes duplicating the spatial and employment patterns of inner cities. These old patterns simply accelerated after World War II. Just as the railroad reorganized urban space in the nineteenth century, the automobile fundamentally redefined the American urban form a century later. For Jackson, in particular, American urban growth was historically unique in its low residential density, strong penchant for home ownership with big lawns, as well as the tendency of middle and wealthy classes to live on the periphery and suffer a long journey to work.⁶⁰

Furthermore, American suburbs are distinctive in their political independence. In comparison to Europe, incorporated suburbs thwarted movements toward metropolitan governance. Suburbs from Brookline, Massachusetts, to Evanston, Illinois, to Beverly Hills, California, fought annexation and evolved as municipalities in opposition to central cities. The racial landscape of America remains the most telling illustration of this fragmented metropolis. From 1950 to 1965, the nonwhite population of cities rose ten times faster than the white population, while in the suburbs the white population grew 36 times more than the nonwhite.⁶¹

Politics and Planning

While social analysis and cultural imagery dominated the agendas of many urbanists, scholarship on politics moved in the opposite direction. Increasingly, urban political historians not only reject the "machine" paradigm for its biographical, episodic, and manichean treatments of urban politics, but remain critical of reducing politics to issues of symbolism and culture.⁶² For Jon Teaford, David Hammack, and Harold Platt, in particular, modern city services and infrastructures created new municipal agencies and special-interest factions that transcended neighborhood and ethnic loyalties, dramatically altering forms of municipal authority. Even elites were never monolithic. Rather, they were internally divided, constantly competing, and shifting alliances depending upon the issues involved. The provision of services and infrastructures in late nineteenth-century cities was, in Teaford's words, an "unheralded triumph." Engineers thus replace elective officials in the political narrative of the city.⁶³

Such examinations of urban political institutions conclude that the "local state" was relatively autonomous from social and cultural patterns. Nineteenth-century municipalities spent far more money than state and federal counterparts. Cities adopted policies of "promotional governance," acted as "economic adventurers," and relied on residential property owners for support, not immigrant or working-class masses looking for patronage or social services. By investing in new physical infrastructures, municipalities underwrote the expansion of a capitalist urban economy.⁶⁴

More significantly, immigrant and working-class groups, traditionally identified as proponents of patronage, actually resisted municipal expansion. In a case study of San Francisco, Terrence McDonald discovered that municipal taxes and expenditures reached historic lows under administrations dominated by Irish politicians (in part, because home ownership increased among immigrants and workers). Progressive reformers and ward bosses alike espoused "pay as you go" philosophies. The pattern of low per capita municipal expenditures from 1890 to 1910, years when allegedly patronage-driven machines were powerful, is repeated in other studies. The watchwords of the age were not "spend, spend, spend" but "economy."⁶⁵

This interpretive framework relegates the machine model of urban politics to myth. While 80 percent of the 30 largest cities had "machines" from 1880 to 1914, few enjoyed a long hegemony, most were "factional," and endured only through two or three elections. Even the prototypical boss, George Washington Plunkitt, suffered a loyal opposition throughout his political career before three defeats finally drove him out of office. Most significantly, battles between bosses and reformers in cities like San Francisco little affected city expenditures. Ideology and institutional structure did. The squandering boss is simply a caricature, the political machine a social construct.⁶⁶

This institutional paradigm has influenced studies of urban crime. In Philadelphia, Allen Steinberg shows how ordinary residents shaped the criminal justice system through citizen prosecutions in the early nineteenth century. By the century's end, the fluid, flexible, and sometimes corrupt system which enabled city dwellers to act as defendants and prosecutors was replaced by a state-administered system which was more efficient but less democratic and participatory. In New York, Eric Monkkenon finds a political economy demanding good services at low cost. Arresting felons was cheap, while prosecuting and punishing them was expensive. Hence, nineteenth-century cities devoted comparatively few resources to the prosecution of criminals.⁶⁷

One weakness of the institutional approach is the overly narrow conception of urban politics. Some argue for a broader paradigm in the form of a "public culture." Thomas Bender was among the earliest to apply Jürgen

Habermas's theory of public and private spheres, not only to explain the changing use of urban space and politics, but as a vehicle synthesizing the voluminous corpus of social history. Rather than defining politics according to elections, parties, budgets, and bureaucracies, Bender urged historians to examine the different manifestations of power, ranging from the state "to the power to establish categories of social analysis and understanding." In effect, Bender called for a "linguistic turn," an examination of the language and discourses that described and shaped political behavior.⁶⁸

The paradigm of a "public culture" locates political life outside the state. Similarly, historians employing gender as an analytic category have argued for a more broadly conceived urban polity. Maureen Flanagan compares male and female "city clubs" with similar class and racial memberships, finding the latter frequently promoted different and conflicting visions of "progressive" politics. Examinations of Roman Catholic nuns and educational unions challenge orthodox interpretations of urban charity and social welfare work that emphasize the influence of Protestant and settlement house ideas. Other studies searching for the origins of the national welfare state increasingly focus on female volunteerism, "cooperative" or "municipal housekeeping," juvenile courts and child health programs, most of which originated or were headquartered in cities.⁶⁹

Historians of the parks movement use the "public culture" paradigm to investigate themes of urban republicanism. Green spaces were not simply works of art. They were envisioned as a pastoral locus of cultivation and cosmopolitanism, a literal and symbolic alternative to unbridled capitalism combatting "the forces of barbarism." Elizabeth Blackmar, Roy Rosenzweig, and Alexander von Hoffman insist that nineteenth-century reformers like Frederick Law Olmsted sought to limit the power of local, elective democracy which they considered "a fundamentally corrupt exchange," not "an expression of popular will." Conflicts over the meaning of "public" thus had cultural, spatial, political, and property-based dimensions. Similarly, private associations like the Chicago Relief and Aid Society not only assumed broad political and "public" responsibilities, but virtually became a "private state" in their control of public resources.⁷⁰

Others scrutinize the language of public life. Mary Ryan and Philip Ethington delineate a nineteenth-century "public discourse" centered around the newspaper and the marketplace, not social tensions or conflicts. Carl Smith treats the Great Fire, the Haymarket incident, and the Pullman strike in Chicago as "texts" expressing certain "imaginative" views of the city. Urban traumas and catastrophes not only haunted urban residents but defined their conception of the city.⁷¹

These "linguistic turns" present new ways of conceptualizing public life

and politics in cities. Historians in search of a public culture emphasize the oratory of electoral campaigns and their associated institutions (parties, newspapers, lobbyists). This method not only illustrates the importance of symbols and politics in the formation of group identities but permits the inclusion of long-ignored groups into political narratives. The attention to language illuminates how certain groups conceptualized the city and civic identity.

Historians focusing on public culture rely on groups and events that created "scripts"—elections, parades, disasters, trials. Such a paradigm, however, ignores the daily operations of the state and veers close to reducing politics to a study of communication, obscuring important political, economic, or social change. Compare Chicago and San Francisco. Using unpublished city council records and debates, Robin Einhorn finds a narrowly-defined polity in early Chicago, one dominated by and organized around real estate interests. By contrast Philip Ethington, relying upon election rhetoric and newspaper coverage, concludes early San Francisco enjoyed a broader, more participatory public life. Only later did that public degenerate into a "politics of needs, interest groups, and government by administration." One is left wondering when the "decline" of public life began. Was the American city really once more "public" than now? If so, for whom? Was it ever open to widespread participation of the majority? Or was it largely plutocratic throughout history?⁷²

These disagreements reflect larger methodological divisions among historians. Institutional interpretations demand that historians analyze measurable *results* (budgets, bureaucratic behavior, infrastructures), not simply the rhetoric of elections or the symbolic banners of parades. Indeed, political historians have devoted surprisingly little research regarding local budgets and bureaucracies. Yet the public culture paradigm has "deconstructed" political "languages" while the organizational structures of urban polities remain largely unknown or misunderstood. Institutional historians point out that reliance on the rhetoric and bombast of ward bosses and journalists only generated the myth of the machine, not accurate history. The institutional interpretation, however, may not explain critical twentieth-century developments. For example, historians studying the emergence of a "second ghetto" after World War II might argue that the municipality embodied certain community values about "whiteness" and race. The government-sanctioned, Northern form of *de jure* segregation effectively incorporated the cultural beliefs of white residents in various municipal institutions.⁷³

Historians of urban planning have, in some respects, unwittingly integrated the institutional and linguistic approaches. Studies of the park and City Beautiful movements base their arguments on the debates, discourses,

and languages grounded in the Olmstedian ideals and rhetoric of the nineteenth century. The origins of comprehensive physical planning are located in the changing concepts and definitions of land use, a very specific dialogue and discourse which emerged at the end of the nineteenth century and marked the beginnings of modernism.⁷⁴

Most histories of twentieth-century planning, however, remain structuralist in methodology and critical of the planning profession, postwar liberals, and their government allies. Overly concerned with "blight," planners addressed the problems of poverty and inequality as physical, not social, problems. While Robert Caro's *The Power Broker* (1974) remains influential, recent interpretations reject his "great man" view of history. These scholars blame the failures of postwar planning on the social engineering ethos of liberalism, the influence of private developers, the ideologies associated with modernism, or some combination thereof. Regardless of liberal, radical or conservative ideologies, planning ultimately reflected the conservative, corporate, pro-growth, and institutional values of the era.⁷⁵

The association of twentieth-century planning with modernism has generated a variety of postmodernist critiques.⁷⁶ Modernism's affection for linear progress, rational planning, standardization of knowledge, new communication systems, and engineering wonders were embraced in projects ranging from Haussman's Paris to Daniel Burnham's Plan of Chicago (1909) to the urban renewal programs of 1950s and 1960s. But after 1970, postmodernists contend, the urban West witnessed a new way of experiencing time and space. The postmodern city is a new urban form, reflected in more flexible modes of capital accumulation, "time-space compression" in the organization of capital, and consumer, image-driven economies. David Harvey even postulates the precise moment of urban modernity's death: 3:32 p.m. on July 15, 1972 when the Pruitt-Igoe housing development in St. Louis, a prize-winning version of LeCorbusier's "machine for modern living," was dynamited.⁷⁷

Many, if not most, urban historians have been slow to openly invoke postmodern and poststructural theory. Calls to entertain and apply such theories literally draw groans.⁷⁸ This is hardly surprising. Although elements of postmodern theory prioritize space as a primary locus of power, many urban histories effectively criticized modernism in the early 1970s—witness Caro's *The Power Broker*. Well before Michel Foucault's spatial theory of *heterotopia*, historians and critics of urban planning displayed a distrust of universal or "totalizing" theories or "meta-narratives."⁷⁹

Indeed, postmodern interpretations of the city seem to ignore or stand outside of history. If any generalization possibly describes urban history, it is that contestation, heterogeneity and confusion define the history of cities.

Fragmentation and indeterminacy are the grist of urban life. Cities have always been complicated and resistant to human-imposed order. Indeed, the characteristics applied to the "postmodern city" mimic many of the qualities recent historians associate with the nineteenth-century industrial metropolis. Then as now, cities were labyrinths, emporiums, theaters—places where people assumed multiple roles and became what they pleased. Personal identities were rendered "soft," open, and endlessly fluid. The multiple forms of industrialization represented and produced disorder. Nearly a century ago, Henry James returned to New York after a long absence and complained about the "chaos" and "invented" qualities of urban life, that Gotham was a "struggle in the void." For James, earlier signals, styles and systems of communication that were the lifeblood of the metropolis were rendered meaningless or incomprehensible.⁸⁰

Indeed, Jane Jacobs was an early "postmodernist." *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961) remains the most influential critique of postwar planning and modern architecture. Published in the same year as the last "meta-narrative"—Lewis Mumford's *The City in History*—Jacobs severely attacked Ebenezer Howard, LeCorbusier, modern city planning, federal policy makers, financiers, even critics of modernism like Mumford. For Jacobs, modern urban planning was "not the rebuilding of cities, [but] the sacking of cities."⁸¹ Her celebration of the chaotic and spatial diversity made Jacobs "anti-modernist" in her time, perhaps postmodernist in ours.

Paradoxically, Disneyland functions as one synthesizing paradigm for this literature on culture, politics, planning, the built environment, and suburbanization. By the early 1960s, Disneyland's imaginary landscape based on collective nostalgia manipulated around consumption was viewed as a "symbolic American utopia." The child-centered, amusement universe of Disneyland (1955) and the adult-centered, postmodern aesthetics of Disney World (1971) emerged during an era when sunbelt cities from Los Angeles to Miami lacked a singular visual identity like the steel mill in the company town or the skyscraper in the modern metropolis. In the current *fin-de-siècle*, Disneyland is the nexus of urban culture and entrepreneurial capital, the representation of a new form of economic growth emphasizing service, order and corporate control, a "symbolic economy" turned real.⁸²

A variety of urbanists see Disneyland as both metaphor and reality, the epitome of the postmodern city. The traditional downtown is replaced by freeways, clusters of suburban homes, isolated office towers, and low-rise industrial parks. The new urban prototype celebrates leisure, affluence, and "quality of life." An urban form rooted in rest and recreation, amusement parks and expositions, spaces of commerce and fantasy—not the production of the industrial metropolis—better explains how American cities developed

in space, time, and character.⁸³ If the Columbian Exposition provides multiple interpretive paradigms for the *fin-de-siècle* metropolis, Mickey Mouse on Main Street (once an antiurban ideal) does the same a century later. "All the world's a fair" is supplanted by "All the world is Disneyland."

Yet, much of this literature ignores important historical continuities. The association of fantasy, illusion, and nostalgia with cities is hardly new. Lewis Mumford aptly recognized this half a century ago: "The metropolis itself may be described as a World's Fair in continuous operation."⁸⁴ Indeed, ideologies of urban and nostalgic fantasy appear in the industrial metropolises of the East and Midwest. Examinations of Times Square, for example, contend that location marked the first time a major city's "agora" was developed for leisure and illusion, not governmental, religious, or market purposes. The most recent work on the evolution of the postwar shopping mall finds the implementation of entertainment and play for marketing and planning strategies. Finally, William Leach convincingly argues that the world's first and most powerful culture of consumption was fathered in the industrial city by the likes of John Wanamaker and Marshall Field, figuratively and literally within their department store windows. The department store and a broad network of institutions—art museums, investment banks, universities, chain stores, advertisers—generated an "urban landscape of consumer desire" by 1930.⁸⁵

Conclusion

For over three decades, urban historians have abandoned the "Mumfordian" meta-narrative. While cultural paradigms serve as the connecting link in this essay, many of the approaches discussed above remain divorced and segregated from each other. Practitioners of certain methodologies and subfields barely know, much less debate, other perspectives. Fragmentation defines the way historians now envision the urban past. Case study, subcultural, interdisciplinary, and postmodern methodologies prove that cities defy easy generalization and definition. While there is much to admire in Mumford's organic urban history linking culture, politics, and technology, his remains a highly romanticized view.⁸⁶ Urbanists have even foregone Sam Bass Warner, Jr.'s call for a comparative, synthesizing "scaffolding" approach because few believe "all the world was Philadelphia." Philadelphia in 1775, New York in 1860, Chicago in 1900, and Los Angeles in 1950 represent distinctive cities having less, not more, in common with urban counterparts.⁸⁷ Consequently, urban history remains a field with no totalizing theory, hegemonic interpretation, or universal paradigm. A plurality of microtheories characterizes the history of American cities.

Even subcultural paradigms fail to offer a synthetic overview. Subcultures

are what make cities cities, and cities enable subcultures to flourish. Yet, urbanists and other historians risk overusing "culture" as an explanatory tool. The history of American cities now incorporates alternative cultures, commercial culture, community culture, consumer culture, criminal cultures, ethnic culture, leisure culture, planning cultures, plebeian cultures, political culture, popular culture, public culture, racial culture, regional culture, sexual cultures, spiritual cultures, women's culture, workers' culture and youth culture. Who and what does not have a culture? Cultural paradigms have opened many new windows in urban history, but the ensuing draft has blown the field into modest chaos.

Some justifiably lament the abandonment of a broad narrative. Most recently, Charles Tilly and Howard Gillette urged urban historians to move toward centrality and away from particularity. Cities offer opportunities to study the interaction between large social processes and the routines of local life, a chance to explore the "total history" of ecology, politics, and society. Others complain that insularity and novelty, not dialogue, characterize the study of cities. Instead of engaging in interdisciplinary research, urbanists have sealed themselves off and narrowed their discussions.⁸⁸

Calls for synthesis, however, risk imposing a new urban orthodoxy. Compare recent subcultural histories on Chicago's African-American migration, an ethnic Catholic parish, and New York's gay community.⁸⁹ A synthesis of their shared attributes might emphasize their marginalized and subordinated conditions. Broadly (or synthetically) speaking, each of these radically different communities built empowered, self-reliant, and alternative subcultures for themselves. Yet, such a portrait flattens a contested social landscape. By definition, synthesis combines different parts to form a whole, emphasizing the shared, the common, and the typical. What is remarkable about these and other urban communities is the singular, the uncommon, the atypical. Glossing over the particular on behalf of the commonplace invites turning the themes of autonomy, independence and power into a reductionist mantra.

For nearly twenty years, urban history has flourished in interdisciplinary chaos, generating its most innovative scholarship. Only a generation ago Richard Wade and others complained about the *paucity* of research on American cities. Today, we know more about American cities than ever before.⁹⁰ Recent urban historiography mirrors the city itself, devoid of continuity, collective agreement, or a single, unifying theme. Like egocentric city residents passing from difference to difference and place to place, urban historians move from subject to subject disconnected and detached (dare I say alienated) from one another.

This state of affairs is hardly surprising. Nor is it necessarily bad. Cities are always in motion, pluralistic, rarely calm, resistant to efforts to logically

comprehend their total meaning. Should we expect anything different from urban scholarship? Henry Adams provided an apt précis: "Chaos was the law of nature; Order was the dream of man."⁹¹

I wish to thank participants in the Urban History Seminar at the Chicago Historical Society, Michael Ebner, Elliott Gorn, Harold Platt, and especially James Grossman for the constructive comments they made on earlier versions of this essay.

1. For purposes of manageability, this essay concentrates on works published since Stanley I. Kutler and Stanley N. Katz, eds., *Reviews in American History* 10 (1982); reprinted as *The Promise of American History: Progress and Prospects* (Baltimore, 1982). Space limitations forced me to exclude many important works from these notes. For a more extensively documented version of this essay, see the article under the same title at the following worldwide web site: <http://homepages.luc.edu/~tgilfoy/index.htm>

2. M. Christine Boyer, *Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), 50–51; Stanley K. Schultz, *Constructing Urban Culture: American Cities and City Planning, 1800–1920* (Philadelphia, 1989), 209–17; William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York, 1991), 341–69, quotes 340, 349; Alan Trachtenberg, *The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age* (New York, 1982), 216, 231; Neil Harris, Wim de Wit, James Gilbert, Robert W. Rydell, *Grand Illusions: Chicago's World's Fair of 1893* (Chicago, 1993), 95, 143; Peter B. Hales, "Photography and the World's Columbian Exposition: A Case Study," *Journal of Urban History* 15 (1989): 269; Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916* (Chicago, 1984), 2.

3. John Kasson, *Amusing the Million: Coney Island at the Turn of the Century* (New York, 1978); Russell Lewis, "Everything Under One Roof: World's Fairs and Department Stores in Paris and Chicago," *Chicago History* 12 (Fall 1983): 29–43; Curtis M. Hinsley, "The World as Marketplace: Commodification of the Exotic at the World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893," in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, ed. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine (Washington, D.C., 1991); James Gilbert, *Perfect Cities: Chicago's Utopias of 1893* (Chicago, 1991), 75–130; William H. Wilson, *The City Beautiful Movement* (Baltimore, 1989), 53–74.

4. Bruce Stave, "A Conversation with Stephan Thernstrom," in *The Making of Urban History: Historiography Through Oral History*, ed. Stave (Beverly Hills, Calif., 1977), 230; Howard Gillette, Jr., introduction to *American Urbanism: A Historiographical Review*, ed. Gillette and Zane L. Miller (New York, 1987), 2.

5. Stephen Aron, "Lessons in Conquest: Towards a Greater Western History," *Pacific Historical Review* 63 (1994): 125–47; William Cronon, George Miles, and Jay Gitlin, eds., *Under an Open Sky: Rethinking America's Western Past* (New York, 1992); Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paula Treichler, eds., *Cultural Studies* (New York, 1992), 3.

6. Few fields have engaged in as much historiographical navel gazing as urban history. I found over 30 articles and at least three books, including 17 since 1980, on the field. The most extensive and recent coverage is in Gillette and Miller, *American Urbanism*; Kathleen Neils Conzen and Michael H. Ebner, "The United States" in *Modern Urban History Research in Europe, U.S.A. and Japan: A Handbook*, ed. Christian Engei and Horst Matzerath (Oxford, Eng., 1989), 207–29, 533–50; and Raymond A. Muhl, "New Perspectives on American Urban History," in *The Making of Urban America*, ed. Muhl (Wilmington, Del., 1997), 335–74.

7. Theodore Hershberg, ed., *Philadelphia: Work, Space, Family, and Group Experience in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1981), 3–35; Olivier Zunz, "The Synthesis of Social Change: Reflections on American Social History," in *Reliving the Past: The Worlds of Social History*, ed. Zunz (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1985), 90; Eric H. Monkkonen, "The Dangers of Synthesis," *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 1146–157.

8. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973); Claude S. Fischer,

"Toward a Subcultural Theory of Urbanism," *American Journal of Sociology* 80 (1975): 1319-41; idem, "The Subcultural Theory of Urbanism: A Twentieth-Year Assessment," *American Journal of Sociology* 101 (1995): 543-77. For critiques of modernization, see Thomas Bender, *Community and Social Change in America* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1978).

9. John Bodnar's *The Transplanted: A History of Immigration in Urban America* (Bloomington, Ind., 1985), has replaced Oscar Handlin's *The Uprooted* (New York, 1951) as the standard interpretation for immigration. The literature on ethnic and racial urban subcultures is vast. Begin with Kenneth W. Goings and Raymond A. Mohl, "Toward a New African American Urban History," in *The New African American Urban History*, ed. Goings and Mohl (Thousand Oaks, Calif., 1996), 1-16; and Kathleen Neils Conzen, David A. Gerber, Ewa Morawska, George Pozzetta, Rudolph J. Vecoli, "The Invention of Ethnicity: A Perspective from the U.S.A.," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 12 (1992): 3-63. For more on race, see note 16. For representative examples of ethnic subcultures, see Zunz, *The Changing Face of Inequality: Urbanization, Industrial Development, and Immigrants in Detroit, 1880-1920* (Chicago, 1982); Donna R. Gabaccia, *From Sicily to Elizabeth Street: Housing and Social Change Among Italian Immigrants, 1880-1930* (Albany, 1984); Gerber, *The Making of American Pluralism: Buffalo, New York, 1825-1860* (Urbana, Ill., 1989); Deborah Dash Moore, *To the Golden Cities: Pursuing the American Jewish Dream in Miami and L.A.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994); George J. Sanchez, *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (New York, 1993); Gary R. Mormino and George E. Pozzetta, *The Immigrant World of Ybor City, Italians and Their Latin Neighbors in Tampa, 1885-1985* (Urbana, Ill., 1987). On ethnic variation and schooling, see Joel Perlmann, *Ethnic Differences: Schooling and Social Structure Among the Irish, Italians, Jews, and Blacks in an American City, 1880-1935* (New York, 1989).

10. Elliott J. Gorn, *The Manly Art: Bare-knuckle Prize Fighting in America* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1986); Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920* (New York, 1983); Kenneth A. Scherzer, *The Unbounded Community: Neighborhood Life and Social Structure in New York City, 1830-1875* (Durham, N.C., 1992); Richard B. Stott, *Workers in Metropolis: Class, Ethnicity, and Youth in Antebellum New York City* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1989); Madelon Powers, *Faces Along the Bar: Lore and Order in the Workingman's Saloon, 1870-1920* (Chicago, 1998).

11. Elizabeth Blackmar, *Manhattan for Rent, 1785-1850* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1989), 164; Richard Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York, 1992), 356; David Rosner, *A Once Charitable Enterprise: Hospitals and Health Care in New York and Brooklyn, 1885-1915* (New York, 1982). On urban elites, see Frederic Cople Jaher, *The Urban Establishment: Upper Strata in Boston, New York, Charleston, Chicago, and Los Angeles* (Urbana, Ill., 1982).

12. Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (New York, 1990); Zunz, *Changing Face*. On the cultural practices and emergence of urban middle classes, see Stuart M. Blumin, *The Emergence of the Middle Class, Social Experience in the American City, 1760-1900* (New York, 1989); Bushman, *Refinement*; Karen Halttunen, *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study in Middle-Class Culture in America, 1830-1860* (New Haven, Conn., 1982); John F. Kasson, *Rudeness and Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century Urban America* (New York, 1990).

13. Spiro Kostof, *America by Design* (New York, 1987); Zeynep Celik, Diane Favro, and Richard Ingersoll, eds., *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space* (Berkeley, Calif., 1994), 4.

14. Earl Lewis, *In Their Own Interests: Race, Class and Power in Twentieth-Century Norfolk, Virginia* (Berkeley, Calif., 1991); Christine Stansell, *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York, 1790-1860* (New York, 1986), esp. 193-216; David Nasaw, *Children of the City: At Work and at Play* (Garden City, N.Y., 1985); Susan G. Davis, *Parades and Power: Street Theater in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1986); Robin D.G. Kelley, "'We Are Not What We Seem': Rethinking Black Working-Class Opposition in the Jim Crow South," *Journal of American History* 80 (1993): 75-112; Shane White, "'It Was a Proud Day': African Americans, Festivals, and Parades in the North, 1741-1834," *Journal of American History* 81 (1994): 13-50; Mary P. Ryan, *Civic Wars: Democracy and Public Life in the American City during the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley, Calif., 1997), esp. 53-93.

15. On the distinctive territorial nature of American urban Catholicism, see John T.

McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North* (Chicago, 1996); Eileen McMahon, *Which Parish are You From? A Chicago Irish Community and Race Relations* (Lexington, Ky., 1995); Dominic A. Pacyga, *Polish Immigrants and Industrial Chicago* (Columbus, Ohio, 1991). On spiritualism in street and spatial rituals, see Robert A. Orsi, *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880–1950* (New Haven, Conn., 1985).

16. More extensive coverage of this literature appears in Goings and Mohl, *New African American Urban History*, 1–16, and the ensuing essays in the volume. Kenneth L. Kusmer, "African Americans in the City Since World War II: From the Industrial to the Post-Industrial Era," *Journal of Urban History* 21 (1995): 458–504; Joe William Trotter, Jr., "African Americans in the City: The Industrial Era, 1900–1950," *Journal of Urban History* 21 (1995): 438–57. On African-American migration, see James R. Grossman, *Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners, and the Great Migration* (Chicago, 1989); Nicholas Lemann, *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America* (New York, 1991); Trotter, ed., *The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class, and Gender* (Bloomington, Ind., 1991). On northern race relations, see James R. Ralph, *Northern Protest: Martin Luther King, Jr., Chicago and the Civil Rights Movement* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994); Cheryl Lynn Greenberg, *Or Does It Explode?: Black Harlem in the Great Depression* (New York, 1991); Roger Lane, *William Dorsey's Philadelphia and Ours: On the Past and Future of the Black City in America* (New York, 1991).

17. Lewis Mumford, *The City in History* (New York, 1961), 446–81.

18. The social history of specific urban industrial structures and physical forms remains largely unstudied. The multiple forms of industrialization can be found by comparing Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788–1850* (New York, 1984); Philip Scranton, *Proprietary Capitalism: The Textile Manufacture in Philadelphia, 1800–1885* (New York, 1983); idem, *Figured Tapestry: Production, Markets and Power in Philadelphia Textiles, 1885–1941* (New York, 1989); Susan E. Hirsch, *The Roots of the American Working Class: The Industrialization of Crafts in Newark, 1800–1860* (Philadelphia, 1978); Steven J. Ross, *Workers on the Edge: Work, Leisure, and Politics in Industrializing Cincinnati, 1788–1890* (New York, 1985); Greg Hise, *Magnetic Los Angeles: Planning the Twentieth-Century Metropolis* (Baltimore, 1997); Josef W. Konvitz, "The Crisis of Atlantic Port Cities, 1880–1920," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 36 (1994): 293–318.

19. For an overview, see Andrea Tuttle Kornbluh, "City Sex: Views of American Women and Urban Culture, 1869–1990," *Urban History Yearbook* 18 (1991): 60–83. Influential works include Suzanne Lebsock, *The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784–1860* (New York, 1984); Elizabeth Ewen, *Immigrant Women in the Land of Dollars: Life and Culture on the Lower East Side, 1890–1925* (New York, 1985); Susan Porter Benson, *Counter Cultures: Saleswomen, Managers, and Customers in American Department Stores, 1890–1940* (Urbana, Ill., 1986).

20. Ruth M. Alexander, *The "Girl Problem": Female Sexual Delinquency in New York, 1900–1930* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1995); Regina G. Kunzel, *Fallen Women, Problem Girls: Unmarried Mothers and the Professionalization of Social Work, 1890–1945* (New Haven, Conn., 1993); Marian J. Morton, *And Sin No More: Social Policy and Unwed Mothers in Cleveland, 1855–1990* (Columbus, Ohio, 1993).

21. On young female subcultures, see Kathy Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia, 1986); Stansell, *City of Women*; Joanne Meyerowitz, *Women Adrift: Independent Wage Earners in Chicago, 1880–1930* (Chicago, 1988); Timothy J. Gilfoyle, *City of Eros: New York City, Prostitution, and the Commercialization of Sex, 1790–1920* (New York, 1992). On gay subcultures, see George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World* (New York: Basic, 1994); Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy and Madeline D. Davis, *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold: The History of a Lesbian Community* (New York, 1993). On urban vernaculars, see William R. Taylor, *In Pursuit of Gotham: Culture and Commerce in New York* (New York, 1992), 109–82; Irving Lewis Allen, *The City in Slang: New York Life and Popular Speech* (New York, 1993).

22. Various aspects of this paragraph can be found in note 21 and Kasson, *Amusing the*

Millions; Lewis A. Erenberg, *Steppin' Out: New York Nightlife and the Transformation of American Culture, 1890-1930* (Westport, Conn., 1981); William R. Taylor, ed. *Inventing Times Square: Commerce and Culture at the Crossroads of the World* (New York, 1991); Robert W. Snyder, *The Voice of the City, Vaudeville and Popular Culture in New York City, 1880-1930* (New York, 1990); Daniel Czitrom, "The Politics of Performance: From Theater Licensing to Movie Censorship in Turn-of-the-Century New York," *American Quarterly* 44 (1992): 525-53; idem, "Underworlds and Underdogs: Big Tim Sullivan and Metropolitan Politics in New York, 1889-1913," *Journal of American History* 78 (1991): 536-58; David Nasaw, *Going Out: The Rise and Fall of Public Amusements* (New York, 1993); Burton Peretti, *The Creation of Jazz: Music, Race and Culture in Urban America* (Urbana, Ill., 1992); Ann Douglas, *Terrible Honesty: Mongrel Manhattan in the 1920s* (New York, 1995); Steven A. Reiss, *City Games: The Evolution of American Urban Society and the Rise of Sports* (Urbana, Ill., 1989); Elaine Abelson, *When Ladies Go A-Thieving: Middle-Class Shoppers in the Victorian Department Store* (New York, 1989).

23. For explicit examples, see various essays in Taylor, *Inventing Times Square*. For elements of this in the antebellum era, see David Reynolds, *Beneath the American Renaissance: The Subversive Imagination in the Age of Emerson and Melville* (New York, 1988).

24. Carl Smith, *Urban Disorder and the Shape of Belief: The Great Chicago Fire, the Haymarket Bomb, and the Model Town of Pullman* (Chicago, 1995), 1-8, 273; Ross Miller, *American Apocalypse: The Great Fire and the Myth of Chicago* (Chicago, 1990). On equating New York with modernity, see Taylor, *Pursuit of Gotham*. On Los Angeles, see Harvey Molotch, "L.A. as Design Product: How Art Works in a Regional Economy," in *The City: Los Angeles and Urban Theory at the End of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Allen J. Scott and Edward W. Soja (Berkeley, Calif., 1996), 247-55.

25. Christopher Silver and John V. Moeser, *The Separate City: Black Communities in the Urban South, 1940-1968* (Lexington, Ky., 1995); Roger Lane, *Roots of Violence in Black Philadelphia, 1860-1900* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986); idem, *William Dorsey's Philadelphia*, 90-92, 128-33. On the relationship between the African-American underworld and urban politics, see Mark Haller, "Policy Gambling, Entertainment, and the Emergence of Black Politics: Chicago From 1900-1940," *Journal of Social History* 24 (1991): 719-40. On the increasingly isolation of antebellum African-Americans, see Gary B. Nash, *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720-1840* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988). For critiques of the literature on urban neighborhoods, see Patricia Mooney-Melvin, "The Neighborhood-City Relationship" in *American Urbanism*, 257-70.

26. See note 35. For critiques and overviews of the "underclass" debate, see Herbert Gans, *The War Against the Poor: The Underclass and Antipoverty Policy* (New York, 1995); Michael Katz, *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare* (New York, 1989); Katz, ed., *The "Underclass" Debate: Views From History* (Princeton, N.J., 1993); Carl Husemoller Nightingale, *On the Edge: A History of Poor Black Children and Their American Dreams* (New York, 1994); William Julius Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy* (Chicago, 1987). Critiques of Wilson include Henry Louis Taylor, Jr., "The Theories of William Julius Wilson and the Black Experience in Buffalo, New York," in *African Americans and the Rise of Buffalo's Post-Industrial City, 1940 to Present* (Buffalo, 1990); Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993). For a comparative history of urban and rural poverty, see Jacqueline Jones, *The Dispossessed: America's Underclasses from the Civil War to the Present* (New York, 1992).

27. Lawrence Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988), 9; Bushman, *Refinement*, 400-408. On "craft entrepreneurs" following this pattern, see Wilentz, *Chants Democratic*, 23-106, 145-71.

28. The most comprehensive work focuses on New York and Chicago. See Robert A.M. Stern, Gregory Gilmartin, John Massengale, *New York 1900: Metropolitan Architecture and Urbanism, 1890-1915* (New York, 1983); Stern, Gilmartin and Thomas Mellins, *New York 1930: Architecture and Urbanism between the Two World Wars* (New York, 1987); Stern, Mellins, David Fishman, *New York 1960: Architecture and Urbanism Between the Second World War and the Bicentennial* (New York, 1995); John Zukowsky, ed., *Chicago Architecture, 1872-1922: Birth*

of a Metropolis (Chicago, 1987); idem, ed., *Chicago Architecture, 1923–1993: Reconfiguration of an American Metropolis* (Chicago, 1993). For a thoughtful introduction to this literature, see Richard Longstreth, "Architecture and the City" in *American Urbanism*, 155–94.

29. David Schuyler, *The New Urban Landscape: The Redefinition of Urban Form in Nineteenth-Century America* (Baltimore, 1986); David C. Sloane, *The Last Great Necessity: Cemeteries in American History* (Baltimore, 1991); John D. Fairfield, *The Mysteries of the Great City: The Politics of Urban Design, 1877–1937* (Columbus, Ohio, 1993); Elizabeth Blackmar and Roy Rosenzweig, *The Park and the People: A History of Central Park* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1992).

30. John S. Garner, ed., *The Company Town: Architecture and Society in the Early Industrial Age* (New York, 1992); Margaret Crawford, *Building the Workingman's Paradise: The Design of American Company Towns* (New York, 1995); Richard K. Lieberman, *Steinway & Sons* (New Haven, Conn., 1995), esp. 77–86; Edward K. Spann, *Hopedale: From Commune to Company Town, 1840–1920* (Columbus, Ohio, 1992).

31. Daniel Bluestone, *Constructing Chicago* (New Haven, Conn., 1991), 143–50 ("cultivated"); Michael Holleran, *Boston's "Changing Times": Origins of Preservation and Planning in America* (Baltimore, 1998); Mona Domosh, *Invented Cities: The Creation of Landscape in Nineteenth-Century New York and Boston* (New Haven, Conn., 1996); Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "The Invention of the Skyscraper: Notes on Its Diverse Histories," *Assemblage* 2 (1987): 110–17.

32. Carol Willis, *Form Follows Finance: Skyscrapers and Skylines in New York and Chicago* (New York, 1995); Sarah Bradford Landau and Carl W. Condit, *Rise of the New York Skyscraper, 1965–1913* (New Haven, Conn., 1996), xiii (architect's superficial); Larry R. Ford, *Cities and Buildings: Skyscrapers, Skid Rows, and Suburbs* (Baltimore, 1994).

33. An excellent summary of housing developments is Eric H. Monkkenon, *America Becomes Urban: The Development of U.S. Cities and Towns, 1780–1980* (Berkeley, Calif., 1988), 183–96. On gender, see Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981); Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America* (New York, 1981). On tenements and working-class housing, see Blackmar, *Manhattan for Rent*; Richard A. Plunz, *A History of Housing in New York City* (New York, 1989); Robert G. Barrows, "Beyond the Tenement: Patterns of American Urban Housing, 1870–1930," *Journal of Urban History* (1983): 395–420. On apartments, see Elizabeth Collins Cromley, *Alone Together: A History of New York's Early Apartments* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1990); Wim de Wit, "Apartment Houses and Bungalows: Building the Flat City," *Chicago History* 12 (Winter 1983–1984): 18–29; Carroll William Westfall, "Home at the Top: Domesticating Chicago's Tall Apartment Buildings," *Chicago History* 14 (Spring 1985): 20–39.

34. On homeownership, see Martin J. Daunton, "Cities of Homes and Cities of Tenements: British and American Comparisons, 1870–1914," *Journal of Urban History* 14 (1988): 283–319; Ann Durkin Keating, *Building Chicago: Suburban Developers and the Creation of a Divided Metropolis* (Columbus, Ohio, 1988); Zunz, *Changing Face*. Matthew Edel, Elliot Sclar, Philip Luria, *Shaky Palaces: Homeownership and Social Mobility in Boston's Suburbanization* (New York, 1984) insist home ownership retarded social and geographic mobility and proved to be a poor investment. Michael Doucet and John Weaver, *Housing the North American City* (Montreal, 1991) counter that such groups wanted to possess their homes and other forms of investment were worse. On mobility, see Ronald Tobey, Charles Wetherell, Jay Brigham, "Moving Out and Settling In: Residential Mobility, Home Owning, and the Public Enframing of Citizenship, 1921–1950," *American Historical Review* 95 (1990): 1395–422. On housing reform, see Gail Radford, *Modern Housing for America: Policy Struggles in the New Deal Era* (Chicago, 1996); Paul Groth, *Living Downtown: The History of Residential Hotels in the United States* (Berkeley, Calif., 1994); Robert B. Fairbanks, *Making Better Citizens: Housing Reform and Community Development Strategy in Cincinnati, 1890–1960* (Urbana, Ill., 1988).

35. The "second ghetto" thesis now enjoys a considerable literature. See Arnold Hirsch, *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940–1960* (New York, 1983); idem, "Massive Resistance in the Urban North: Trumbull Park, Chicago, 1953–1966," *Journal of American History* 82 (1995): 522–50; Raymond A. Mohl, "Making the Second Ghetto in

Metropolitan Miami, 1940–1960,” *Journal of Urban History* 21 (1995): 395–427; Charles F. Casey-Leininger, “Making the Second Ghetto in Cincinnati: Avondale, 1925–1970,” in *Race and the City: Work, Community, and Protest in Cincinnati, 1820–1970*, ed. Henry Louis Taylor, Jr. (Urbana, Ill., 1993); Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton, N.J., 1996), esp. 209–71. Other important works include: J. Anthony Lukas, *Common Ground: A Turbulent Decade in the Lives of Three American Families* (New York, 1985); Ronald P. Formisano, *Boston Against Busing, Race, Class, and Ethnicity in the 1960s and 1970s* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1991); John F. Bauman, *Public Housing, Race, and Renewal: Urban Planning in Philadelphia, 1920–1974* (Philadelphia, 1987). On “hyperghettos” and the “underclass,” see Wilson, *Truly Disadvantaged*; idem, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York, 1996); Camilo Jose Vergara, *The New American Ghetto* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1995), esp. 105.

36. For interpretations that locate the breakdown of the New Deal coalition with Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty after 1965, see Jonathan Reider, *Canarsie: The Jews and Italians of Brooklyn against Liberalism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985); Thomas Byrne Edsall and Mary D. Edsall, *Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights and Taxes on American Politics* (New York, 1991).

37. Much of this analysis, especially the work of Arnold Hirsch, preceded the recent scholarship on racial construction and “whiteness.” For more on the social construction of whiteness, see David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London, 1991); Alexander Saxton, *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (London, 1990). On the split between the languages of workers in the workplace and the residential neighborhood, see Ira Katznelson, *City Trenches: Urban Politics and the Patterning of Class in the United States* (New York, 1981).

38. While rioting and crowd behavior continue to generate a significant literature, recent overviews devote little analysis to racially-oriented communal uprisings. See Paul A. Gilje, *Rioting in America* (Bloomington, Ind., 1996). On nineteenth-century riots, see idem, *The Road to Mobocracy, Popular Disorder in New York City, 1763–1834* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1987); Iver Bernstein, *The New York City Draft Riots: Their Significance for American Society and Politics in the Age of the Civil War* (New York, 1989); Neil Larry Shumsky, *From Bullets to Ballots: Society, Politics, and the Crowd in San Francisco, 1877–1880* (Columbus, Ohio, 1991). On the twentieth century, see note 35 and Fred Harris and Roger W. Wilkins, eds., *Quiet Riots: Race and Poverty in the United States* (New York, 1988); Mauricio Mazon, *The Zoot-Suit Riots: The Psychology of Symbolic Annihilation* (Austin, Tex., 1984); Sidney Fine, *Violence in the Model City: The Cavanaugh Administration, Race Relations, and the Detroit Riot of 1967* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1989); Cheryl Greenberg, “The Politics of Disorder: Reexamining Harlem’s Riots of 1935 and 1943,” *Journal of Urban History* 18 (1992): 395–441; Dominic Capeci, Jr. and Martha J. Wilkerson, *Layered Violence: The Detroit Rioters of 1943* (Jackson, Miss., 1991). On the Los Angeles riot or rebellion of 1992, see Mark Baldassare, ed., *The Los Angeles Riots: Lessons for the Urban Future* (Boulder, Colo., 1994).

39. The work of Joel A. Tarr and Josef W. Konvitz remains the most influential. See Tarr, *The Search for the Ultimate Sink: Urban Pollution in Historical Perspective* (Akron, Ohio, 1996); idem and Gabriel Dupuy, eds., *Technology and the Rise of the Networked City in Europe and America* (Philadelphia, 1988); Konvitz, *The Urban Millennium: The City Building Process from the Early Middle Ages to the Present* (Carbondale, Ill., 1985). Comprehensive outlines on the vast literature on urban technologies and the environment include: Tarr and Konvitz, “Patterns in the Development of the Urban Infrastructure,” in *American Urbanism*, 195–226; Christine Meisner Rosen and Tarr, “The Importance of an Urban Perspective in Environmental History,” *Journal of Urban History* 20 (1994): 299–309; Martin Melosi, “The Place of the City in Environmental History,” *Environmental History Review* 17 (1993): 1–23.

40. Various parts of this paragraph appear in Harold L. Platt, *The Electric City: Energy and the Growth of the Chicago Area, 1880–1930* (Chicago, 1991); idem, “Invisible Gases: Smoke, Gender, and the Redefinition of Environmental Policy in Chicago, 1900–1920,” *Planning Perspectives* 10 (1995): 67–97; Christine Meisner Rosen, *The Limits of Power: Great Fires and the*

Process of City Growth in America (New York, 1986); idem, "Infrastructural Improvement in Nineteenth-Century Cities: A Conceptual Framework and Cases," *Journal of Urban History* 12 (1986): 211–56; Andrew Hurley, *Environmental Inequalities: Class, Race and Industrial Pollution in Gary, Indiana, 1945–1980* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1995); idem, ed., *Common Fields: An Environmental History of St. Louis* (St. Louis, 1997); Martin Melosi, *Garbage in the Cities: Refuse, Reform, and the Environment, 1880–1980* (College Station, Tex., 1981); Mark H. Rose, *Cities of Light and Heat: Domesticating Gas and Electricity in Urban America* (University Park, Pa., 1995); Howard Rosen and Ann Durkin Keating, eds., *Water and the City: The Next Century* (Chicago, 1991); Suellen Hoy, *Chasing Dirt: The American Pursuit of Cleanliness* (New York, 1995); and note 39.

41. Sam Bass Warner, Jr., *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870–1900* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962); idem, *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Its Growth* (Philadelphia, 1968).

42. Robin L. Einhorn, *Property Rules: Political Economy in Chicago, 1833–1872* (Chicago, 1991); Keating, *Building Chicago*; Harold L. Platt, *City Building in the New South: The Growth of Public Services in Houston, 1830–1915* (Philadelphia, 1983); Hannah McKinney, *The Development of Local Public Services: Lessons From Middletown, Connecticut, 1650–1860* (Westport, Conn., 1995). On private attempts to restructure cities, see Diana Tittle, *Rebuilding Cleveland: The Cleveland Foundation and Its Evolving Urban Strategy* (Columbus, Ohio, 1992).

43. Alexander von Hoffmann, *Local Attachments: The Making of an American Urban Neighborhood* (Baltimore, 1995); Monkkonen, *America Becomes Urban*, 162–63; Einhorn, *Property Rules*; Keating, *Building Chicago*.

44. On twentieth-century mass transit, see Clifton Hood, *722 Miles: The Building of the Subways and How They Transformed New York* (New York, 1994); Glenn Yago, *The Decline of Transit: Urban Transportation in German and U.S. Cities, 1900–1970* (New York, 1984). On the General Motors controversy, see Scott L. Bottles, *Los Angeles and the Automobile: The Making of the Modern City* (Berkeley, Calif., 1987), esp. 1–4, 238–42. The best recent studies of the impact of cars on streets are Clay McShane, *Down the Asphalt Path: American Cities and the Coming of the Automobile* (New York, 1994); Martin Wachs and Margaret Crawford, eds., *The Car and the City: The Automobile, the Built Environment, and Daily Urban Life* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1991).

45. Robert Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia* (New York, 1987) ("technoburbs"); Michael Ebner, "Experiencing Megalopolis in Princeton," *Journal of Urban History* 19 (1993): 11–55; Mark Baldassare, *Trouble in Paradise: The Suburban Transformation of America* (New York, 1986) (disurbs); Joel Garreau, *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier* (New York, 1991); Jon Teaford, *Post-Suburbia: Government and Politics in the Edge Cities* (Baltimore, 1996). On theory and Southern California, see Mike Davis, *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles* (London, 1990); Scott and Soja, *The City*; Michael J. Dear, H. Eric Schockman, Greg Hise, eds., *Rethinking Los Angeles* (Thousand Oaks, Calif., 1996). For revised definitions of "urbanism," see William Sharpe and Leonard Wallock, "From 'Great Town' to 'Nonplace Urban Realm': Reading the Modern City," in *Visions of the Modern City*, ed. Sharpe and Wallock (Baltimore, 1987), 1–50. This intellectual shift generated an outpouring of new urban biographies, long considered a subfield within regionalist interpretations. Space limitations, however, prohibits a discussion of this literature.

46. Roger Lotchin, *Fortress California, 1910–1961: From Warfare to Welfare* (New York, 1992); Gerald D. Nash, *The American West Transformed: The Impact of the Second World War* (Bloomington, Ind., 1985).

47. Kevin Starr, *Inventing the Dream: California Through the Progressive Era* (New York, 1985); idem, *Material Dreams: Southern California Through the 1920s* (New York, 1990); idem, *Endangered Dreams: The Great Depression in California* (New York, 1996).

48. William Cronon, "Kennebott Journey" in *Under an Open Sky*, 39–40; idem, *Nature's Metropolis*. On western urbanization, see Richard White "It's Your Misfortune and None of My Own": A History of the American West (Norman, Ok., 1991), 541–72; Carol A. O'Connor, "A Region of Cities," in *The Oxford History of the American West*, ed. Clyde A. Milner II, Carol A. O'Connor and Martha Sandweiss (New York, 1994), 534–63; Carl Abbott, "The Metropolitan

Region: Western Cities in the New Urban Era," in *The Twentieth Century West: Historical Interpretations*, ed. Gerald D. Nash and Richard W. Etulain (Albuquerque, 1989), 71–98. For comparisons of "urban frontiers," see David Hamer, *New Towns in the New World: Images and Perceptions of the Nineteenth-Century Urban Frontier* (New York, 1990); Andrew Lees, *Cities Perceived: Urban Society in European and American Thought, 1820–1940* (New York, 1985).

49. Anthony Orum, *City-Building in America* (Boulder, Colo., 1995); Timothy R. Mahoney, *River Towns in the Great West: The Structure of Provincial Urbanization in the American Midwest, 1820–1870* (New York, 1990); Jeffrey S. Adler, *Yankee Merchants and the Making of the Urban West: The Rise and Fall of Antebellum St. Louis* (New York, 1991); Anthony Sutcliffe, ed., *Metropolis 1890–1940* (London, 1984).

50. On the distinctiveness of western and southwestern urbanization, see note 48 and Abbott, "Southwestern Cityscapes: Approaches to an American Urban Environment," in *Essays on Sunbelt Cities and Recent Urban America*, ed. Robert B. Fairbanks and Kathleen Underwood (College Station, Tex., 1990), 59–86; Richard M. Bernard and Bradley R. Rice, eds., *Sunbelt Cities: Politics and Growth Since World War II* (Austin, Tex., 1983). For a critique of the "sunbelt" concept, see Raymond A. Mohl, ed., *Searching for the Sunbelt* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1989).

51. Carl Abbott, "Dimensions of Regional Change in Washington, D.C.," *American Historical Review* 95 (1990): 1367–93; David Goldfield, *Cottonfields and Skyscrapers: Southern City and Region, 1607–1980* (Baton Rouge, 1982); idem, "The Urban South: A Regional Framework," *American Historical Review* 86 (1981): 1009–34. On southern urbanization, see Randall M. Miller and George E. Pozzetta, eds., *Shades of the Sunbelt: Essays on Ethnicity, Race, and the Urban South* (Westport, Conn., 1988); Lawrence H. Larsen, *The Urban South: A History* (Lexington, Ky., 1990); and note 52.

52. Don H. Doyle, *New Men, New Cities, New South: Atlanta, Nashville, Charleston, Mobile, 1860–1910* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1990). On race relations in southern cities, see Ronald H. Bayor, *Race and the Shaping of Twentieth-Century Atlanta* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1996); David Goldfield, *Black, White and Southern: Race Relations and Southern Culture, 1940 to the Present* (Baton Rouge, 1990); David Colburn, *Racial Change and Community Crisis: St. Augustine, Florida, 1877–1980* (New York, 1985). Among southern cities, Washington, D.C. has generated considerable study because of its unique position as the nation's capital. See Howard Gillette, Jr., *Between Justice and Beauty: Race, Planning, and the Failure of Urban Policy in Washington, D.C.* (Baltimore, 1995), xi–xii, 213; Harry Jaffe and Tom Sherwood, *Dream City: Race, Power and the Decline of Washington, D.C.* (New York, 1994); Alan Lessoff, *The Nation and Its City: Politics, "Corruption," and Progress in Washington, D.C., 1861–1902* (Baltimore, 1994).

53. Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York, 1985), 184; Robert Fishman, "The Post-War American Suburb: A New Form, a New City," in *Two Centuries of American Planning*, ed. Daniel Schaffer (Baltimore, 1988). On the rise of the residential subdivision, see Marc A. Weiss, *The Rise of the Community Builders: The American Real Estate Industry and Urban Land Planning* (New York, 1987).

54. M. Gottdiener, *The Social Production of Urban Space*, second edition (Austin, Tex., 1994), ix.

55. John R. Stilgoe, *Borderland: Origins of the American Suburb, 1820–1939* (New Haven, Conn., 1988); Henry Binford, *The First Suburbs: Residential Communities on the Boston Periphery, 1815–1860* (Chicago, 1984); Michael H. Ebner, *Creating Chicago's North Shore: A Suburban History* (Chicago, 1988); David R. Contosta, *Suburb in the City: Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, 1850–1990* (Columbus, Ohio, 1992). On European romanticism and British town planning, see Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias*; John Archer, "Ideology and Aspiration: Individualism, the Middle Class and the Genesis of the Anglo-American Suburb," *Journal of Urban History* 14 (1988): 214–53.

56. Sloane, *Last Great Necessity*; Stanley Buder, *Visionaries and Planners: The Garden City Movement and the Modern Community* (New York, 1990); Carol O'Connor, *A Sort of Utopia: Scarsdale, 1881–1981* (Albany, 1983); James Machor, *Pastoral Cities: Urban Ideals and the Symbolic Landscape of America* (Madison, Wis., 1987); David Schuyler, *Apostle of Taste: Andrew Jackson Downing, 1815–1822* (Baltimore, 1996).

57. Margaret Marsh, *Suburban Lives* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1990); Barbara M. Kelly, *Expanding the American Dream: Building and Rebuilding Levittown* (Albany, 1993).

58. Herbert J. Gans, "Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life: A Reevaluation of Definitions," in *Metropolis: Center and Symbol of Our Times*, ed. Philip Kasinitz (New York, 1995); Robert Bruegmann, "Schaumburg, Oak Brook, Rosemont, and the Recentering of the Chicago Metropolitan Area" in *Chicago Architecture, 1923-1993*, 159-77; James L. Wunsch, "The Suburban Cliche," *Journal of Social History* 28 (1995): 643-58. On "self-building," see Zunz, *Changing Face*, 161; Richard Harris, *Unplanned Suburbs: Toronto's American Tragedy, 1900-1950* (Baltimore, 1996); Sugrue, *Origins of the Urban Crisis*, 37-41.

59. On suburbs as a way of life, see Sharpe and Wallock, et al., "Bold New City or Built-Up 'Burb? Redefining Contemporary Suburbia" and "Comments," *American Quarterly* 46 (1994): 1-61.

60. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 5-11, 181-84, 266-69 (factory and employment deconcentration), 215-16 (homeowners), 303 ("model"); von Hoffman, *Local Attachments*, 15-21. On the social complexity of American suburbs over time, see Carol A. O'Connor, "The Suburban Mosaic: Patterns of Land Use, Class, and Culture" in *American Urbanism*, 243-56; Daniel Schaffer, "Post-Suburban America," *Built Environment* 17 (1991): 185-286. See insightful syntheses in Michael H. Ebner, "Re-Reading Suburban America: Urban Population Deconcentration, 1819-1980" in *American Urbanism*, 227-42; and Margaret Marsh, "Reconsidering the Suburbs: An Exploration of Suburban Historiography," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 112 (1988): 579-605.

61. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Metropolitan Social and Economic Disparities: Implications for Intergovernmental Relations in Central Cities and Suburbs* (Washington, D.C., 1965); Jackson, *Crabgrass*, 138-56, 276-78; David Rusk, *Cities Without Suburbs* (Baltimore, 1996). A good overview of this literature is Mary Corbin Sies, "The City Transformed: Nature, Technology, and the Suburban Ideal, 1877-1917," *Journal of Urban History* 14 (1987): 81-111. On the understudied subject of African-American suburbs, see Andrew Wiese, "Places of Our Own: Suburban Black Towns before 1960," *Journal of Urban History* 19 (1993): 30-54.

62. Jon C. Teaford, "Finis for Tweed and Steffens: Rewriting the History of Urban Rule," *Reviews in American History* 10 (1982): 133-49.

63. Teaford, *The Unheralded Triumph: City Government in America, 1870-1900* (Baltimore, 1984), esp. 139; Platt, *City Building*; David C. Hammack, *Power and Society: Greater New York at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* (New York, 1982). On the absence of a dominating elite in San Francisco, see Philip J. Ethington, *The Public City: The Political Construction of Urban Life in San Francisco, 1850-1900* (New York, 1994), esp. 307-8; William Issel and Robert W. Cherney, *San Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development* (Berkeley, Calif., 1986).

64. Eric H. Monkkonen, *The Local State: Public Money and American Cities* (Stanford, Calif., 1995) ("economic adventurers"); Lessoff, *Nation and Its City*, 11 ("promotional governance"); Terrence McDonald, "Building the Impossible State: Toward an Institutional Analysis of Statebuilding in America, 1820-1930," in *Institutions in American Society: Essays in Market, Political, and Social Organizations*, ed. John E. Jackson (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1990), 217-39, esp. 226.

65. McDonald, *The Parameters of Urban Fiscal Policy: Socioeconomic Change and Political Culture in San Francisco, 1860-1906* (Berkeley, Calif., 1986); M. Craig Brown and Charles N. Halaby, "Machine Politics in America, 1870-1945," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 17 (1987): 587-612.

66. Brown and Halaby, "Machine Politics," 17 (1987), 611 (weak and "factional" machines); idem, "Bosses, Reform, and the Socioeconomic Bases of Urban Expenditure, 1890-1940," in *The Politics of Urban Fiscal Policy*, ed. McDonald and Sally K. Ward (Beverly Hills, Calif., 1984), 69-100; McDonald, "The Problem of the Political in Recent American Urban History: Liberal Pluralism and the Rise of Functionalism," *Social History* 10 (1985): 324-45. On Plunkitt, see McDonald, "How George Washington Plunkitt Became Plunkitt of Tammany Hall," in *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall*, ed. McDonald (New York, 1994). For arguments that ward

bosses were influential agents of cultural production, see Czitrom, "The Politics of Performance"; idem, "Underworlds and Underdogs." On twentieth-century urban machines, see Chris McNickle, *To Be Mayor of New York: Ethnic Politics in the City* (New York, 1993); Steven P. Erie, *Rainbow's End, Irish Americans and the Dilemmas of Machine Politics, 1840-1985* (Berkeley, Calif., 1988); Roger Biles, *Richard J. Daley: Politics, Race, and the Governing of Chicago* (DeKalb, Ill., 1995); Kenneth Finegold, *Experts and Politicians: Reform Challenges to Machine Politics in New York, Cleveland, and Chicago* (Princeton, N.J., 1995).

67. Allen Steinberg, *The Transformation of Criminal Justice: Philadelphia, 1800-1880* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1989); Eric H. Monkkenen, "Racial Factors in New York City Homicides, 1800-1874," in *Ethnicity, Race, and Crime: Perspectives Across Time and Space*, ed. Darnell F. Hawkins (Albany, 1995), 113.

68. Thomas Bender, *New York Intellect: A History of Intellectual Life in New York City, From 1750 to the Beginning of our Own Time* (New York, 1987); idem, "Whole or Parts: The Need for Synthesis in American History," *Journal of American History* 73 (1986): 126-36 ("categories").

69. Wilson, *City Beautiful Movement*, 129-36, 172-80. This paragraph can only touch upon this vast and growing literature. See Maureen A. Flanagan, "Gender and Urban Political Reform: The City Club and the Woman's City Club of Chicago in the Progressive Era," *American Historical Review* 95 (1990): 1032-50; idem, *Charter Reform in Chicago* (Carbondale, Ill., 1987); idem, "Women in the City. Women of the City: Where Do Women Fit in Urban History?" *Journal of Urban History* 23 (1997): 251-59; Suellen Hoy, "Caring for Chicago's Women and Girls: The Sisters of the Good Shepherd, 1859-1911," *ibid.*, 260-94; Janice L. Reiff, "A Modern Lear and His Daughters: Gender in the Model Town of Pullman," *Journal of Urban History* 22 (1996): 316-41; Karen Sawislak, *Smoldering City: Chicagoans and the Great Fire, 1871-1874* (Chicago, 1995); Philip J. Ethington, "Recasting Urban Political History: Gender, the Public, the Household, and Political Participation in Boston and San Francisco during the Progressive Era," *Social Science History* 16 (1992): 301-33; Sarah Deutsch, "Learning to Talk More Like a Man: Boston Women's Class-Bridging Organizations, 1870-1940," *American Historical Review* 97 (1992): 379-404.

70. Schuyler, *New Urban Landscape*, 93-97 (barbarism); Bluestone, *Constructing Chicago*, 8, 20-25; Rosenzweig and Blackmar, *Park and the People*, 4-11, 278; von Hoffman, *Local Attachments*, 80-86; Sawislak, *Smoldering City*, esp. 261-73.

71. Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 6; Ethington, *Public City*, 345, 407-8; Smith, *Urban Disorder*, 1-8, 64, 273.

72. Einhorn, *Property Rules*; Ethington, *Public City*, 345 ("needs"), 407-8; Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 99-100. These questions raise many of the same issues regarding community declension discussed in Bender, *Community and Social Change*. For other critiques, see Bruce Robbins, ed., *The Public as Phantom Public Sphere* (Minneapolis, 1993), vii-xxvi; Craig Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (New York, 1992).

73. See note 35, especially Hirsch, Mohl, and Sugrue.

74. Wilson, *City Beautiful Movement*, locates its lineage with Olmsted and nineteenth-century rhetoric. On changing definitions of land use, see Richard E. Foglesong, *Planning the Capitalist City: The Colonial Era to the 1920s* (Princeton, N.J., 1986). On planning as a modernist discourse, see Boyer, *Dreaming the Rational City*. For recent overviews, see Mary Corbin Sies and Christopher Silver, "The History of Planning History"; and idem, "Planning History and the New American Metropolis," in *Planning the Twentieth-Century American City*, ed. Sies and Silver (Baltimore, 1996), 1-34, 449-73.

75. Robert A. Caro, *The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York* (New York, 1974); Jon C. Teaford, *The Rough Road to Renaissance: Urban Revitalization in America, 1940-1985* (Baltimore, 1990); Howard Gillette, Jr., "The Evolution of Neighborhood Planning: From the Progressive Era to the 1949 Housing Act," *Journal of Urban History* 9 (1983): 421-44; Joel Schwartz, *The New York Approach: Robert Moses, Urban Liberals, and the Redevelopment of the Inner City* (Columbus, Ohio, 1993); Thomas Kessner, *Fiorello H. LaGuardia and the Making of Modern New York* (New York, 1989); John Findlay, *Magic Lands: Western Cityscapes and American Culture After 1940* (Berkeley, Calif., 1992), esp. 285-87; Mansel G. Blackford, *The*

Lost Dream: Businessmen and City Planning on the Pacific Coast, 1890–1920 (Columbus, Ohio, 1993).

76. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford, Eng., 1989), 9–27; Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994); Sharon Zukin, *The Cultures of Cities* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995), esp. 289–94; idem, *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disneyland* (Berkeley, Calif., 1991), 283. For other “postmodern” critiques, see Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London, 1989); Michael Sorkin, ed., *Variations on a Theme Park: Scenes from the New American City* (New York, 1990); Davis, *City of Quartz*; Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

77. Harvey, *Condition of Postmodernity*, vii, 5–6, 39 (Fruitt), and note 75.

78. See the reaction to Mary Corbin Sies’ plenary address to the Society for American City and Regional Planning History in 1995, *Planning History Present* 9 (1995): i–2.

79. Michel Foucault, “Of Other Spaces,” *Diacritics* (Spring 1986): 22–27.

80. This description of cities is found in Jonathan Raban, *Soft City* (London, 1972), and employed in Harvey, *Postmodernity*. See James, *The American Scene* (New York, 1967), 1–8, 77, 162. On the confusion over social identities in the nineteenth century, see note 12. On the nineteenth-century street as theater, see note 14. On the “invented” quality of the modern city, see Taylor, *Inventing*. On disorder and the confusing varieties of industrial capitalism, see notes 18 and 24.

81. Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York, 1961), 4, 25. On the limitations of these labels, see Robert Fishman, “The Mumford-Jacobs Debate,” *Planning History Studies* 10 (1996): 3–11.

82. Findlay, *Magic Lands*, 46–116; Carl Abbott, *The Metropolitan Frontier: Cities in the Modern American West* (Tucson, 1993); Sorkin, *Variations*, 126, 205–32; O’Connor, “A Region of Cities,” 548–62; Zukin, *Cultures of Cities*, 50, 64, 77; idem, *Landscapes*, 217–50.

83. Ibid.

84. Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities* (New York, 1938), 265. The reaction against illusion and fantasy remains strong in some urbanist and architectural circles. See Ada Louise Huxtable, *The Unreal America: Architecture and Illusion* (New York, 1997); Thomas Bender, “City Lite”; and Nicolai Ouroussoff, “It’s No Mirage,” in *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 22, 1996.

85. William R. Leach, *Land of Desire: Merchants, Power and the Rise of New American Culture* (New York, 1993), 266, 380–81. On Times Square, see Taylor, *Inventing*; idem, *Pursuit of Gotham*, 93–108. On shopping malls, see Elizabeth Cohen, “From Town Center to Shopping Center: The Reconfiguration of Community Marketplaces in Postwar America”; Thomas W. Hanchett, “U.S. Tax Policy and the Shopping-Center Boom of the 1950s and 1960s”; and Kenneth T. Jackson, “All the World’s a Mall: Reflections on the Social and Economic Consequences of the American Shopping Center,” *American Historical Review* 101 (1996): 1050–121; Richard Longstreth, *City Center to Regional Mall: Architecture, the Automobile, and Retailing in Los Angeles, 1920–1950* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997).

86. Mumford continues to fascinate historians, virtually generating an entire field of “Mumford studies.” The most complete biography is Donald L. Miller, *Lewis Mumford: A Life* (Pittsburgh, 1992).

87. Warner, *Private City*. An exception that employs Warner’s scaffolding is James Lemon, *Liberal Dreams and Nature’s Limits: Great Cities of North America Since 1600* (New York, 1996).

88. Charles Tilly, “What Good is Urban History?” *Journal of Urban History* 22 (1996): 702–19; Gillette, “Rethinking American Urban History: New Directions for the Posturban Era,” *Social Science History* 14 (1990): 203–28; Gottdiener, *Social Production*, vii–xv.

89. For purposes of comparison, see Grossman, *Land of Hope*; McMahon, *Which Parish are You From?*; and Chauncey, *Gay New York*.

90. Richard Wade, “An Agenda for Urban History,” in *The State of American History*, ed. Herbert J. Bass (Chicago, 1970), 43–44; Dana F. White, “The Underdeveloped Discipline:

Interdisciplinary Directions in American Urban History," *American Studies: An International Newsletter* 9 (1971): 3-16. Consider the growing number of encyclopedias on individual cities: Kenneth T. Jackson, ed. *The Encyclopedia of New York City* (New Haven, Conn., 1995); David J. Bodenhamer and Robert G. Barrows, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Indianapolis* (Bloomington, Ind., 1994); David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, 2nd edition (Bloomington, Ind., 1996); Leonard Pitt and Dale Pitt, *Los Angeles A to Z: An Encyclopedia of the City and County* (Berkeley, Calif., 1997); James Grossman, Ann Durkin Keating, and Jan Reiff, eds., *Encyclopedia of Chicago History* (Chicago, forthcoming).

91. Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, ed. Ernest Samuels (1918; Boston, 1973), 451. I am indebted to Timothy Spears for this source.