Urban History Review
Revue d'histoire urbaine

Spencer, Elaine Glovka. *Police and the Social Order in German Cities: The Düsseldorf District, 1848–1914*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1992. Pp. xvi, 245. 8 tables. US$ 32.50

Karl Wegert

See table of contents

Explore this journal

Cite this review

workers, later the middle-class, was the other. Never was the objective to improve housing for the truly impoverished. And the provisions to relocate families whose homes were demolished, families that were almost invariably poor and disproportionately black and Puerto Rican, were systematically inadequate.

In *The Power Broker* (1974), Robert Caro attributes the disturbing disregard for redevelopment's uprooted tenants to the imperious personality of city master builder Robert Moses. Schwartz acknowledges Moses's tactics, but with the perceptive eye of a scholar provides rich evidence that the city's politicians and housing officials, its civic elite and the leaders of the neighbourhoods most affected, supported Moses's programs, or at least winked at them. Institutions like Sloane Kettering Memorial Hospital and NYU-Bellevue Medical Center actively encouraged Moses to clear unwanted slums from their neighbourhoods.

The new research provides an important corrective. New York's redevelopment initiatives were not the product of a brilliant public servant run amok. They were the result of a consensus in favor of subsidized housing for workers and middle-class New Yorkers, and for eliminating substandard tenements without much regard for where their inhabitants would go. The roots of this New York Approach can be found in the Progressive Era. Jacob Riis, Mary Simkhovitch and others sought to improve the living conditions of the "worthy poor" whose work habits and morality justified help. The approach consciously excluded the most troublesome slum dwellers. Moses simply implemented, with fierce effectiveness, programs consistent with New York's liberal tradition.

Official stinginess and a cavalier attitude towards the dispossessed are principal

reasons Schwartz declares New York's redevelopment program immoral. He proves the meagerness of relocation provisions, showing, for example, that only 28 per cent of the displaced at the Manhattantown project could expect to find apartments in public housing, and that the Stuyvesant Town relocation allowance came to a paltry $57.30 per household. Ironically, however, the poor, who, as Schwartz so passionately reminds us, were forgotten, remain invisible in his book. We never learn what actually happened to the displaced and if they suffered. The study never responds to the implicit logic of the redevelopers who assumed that construction of thousands of new apartments would raise the quality of the city's housing stock sufficiently to leave even the poor better off when the human shell game stopped.

Redevelopment projects solidified the segregation of New York's neighbourhoods because public officials were unwilling to confront the racial attitudes of the times. They conceived of buildings as black or white depending on location and actively avoided any effort to integrate the city. Site clearance in industrial and manufacturing neighbourhoods intensified and accelerated the flight of low skill jobs from New York. In assessing the impact of this blue collar blight, however, the author goes too far by dismissing the argument that a structural shift in the national and world economies was the fundamental reason manufacturing disappeared from the city.

In his concluding insights, Schwartz condemns the undemocratic process and damaging results of redevelopment. The program gave "moral sanction to inequitable priorities," he writes. But he provides no balance. He never acknowledges the value of the housing built. He offers no quarter for pragmatic liberals who closed their eyes to perplexing problems of race and class because they believed the programs they sup-

ported accomplished the greatest possible good within the limits prevailing attitudes imposed. Despite the moralizing tone, and occasional hyperbole, like a declaration that the Title I program may be the watershed of New York's history in the twentieth century, the book is eminently readable, an excellent piece of scholarship and a provocative history of a program enormously important to America's largest city.

Chris McNickle
Bronx, New York

Spencer, Elaine Glovka. *Police and the Social Order in German Cities: The Düsseldorf District, 1848-1914.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1992. Pp. xvi, 245. 8 tables. US$ 32.50

In the aftermath of the 1848-49 revolutions, the Prussian state adopted a policy on matters relating to the police and the maintenance of public order which remained basically in place so long as the monarchy survived. Throughout the imperial era the state government adhered to its own vision of control through effective policing, sometimes appearing inclined to accommodate the demands of urban elites worried by working-class unruliness but most times retaining a firm command over the apparatus of control, a command exercized with growing confidence as the decades rolled by. In this short case-study of a district in the industrialized Ruhr, Elaine Glovka Spencer manages to address a range of issues of interest and importance to students of modern Europe in general as well as to students of urban institutions in particular: social control strategies, the mechanisms of control, the perception of "order," bourgeois and elitist, and the manner in which this cluster of concerns both defined and was shaped by the dynamic between the state and local (urban) authority.

The economically difficult years after 1873 witnessed a convergence of interest in maintaining law and order as both urban politicians and state bureaucrats focused on the police, making available to it more resources, elevating its status, and expanding its responsibilities. A marked increase in the number of working men concentrated in cities, exaggerated fears of the assumed inherent criminality of marginalized proletarians (as unemployment figures rose), and the accompanying erosion within cities of older more informal, face-to-face checks and balances for maintaining order prompted those who controlled the means of production and those responsible for administering the institutional superstructure firmly to embrace one another.

Missing from Spencer's analysis is a more direct discussion of just how rigorous the constantly implied top-down, vertical integration of society in the Düsseldorf district really was. The impression given — which, admittedly, is the prevailing orthodoxy in the literature on this topic — is that the Prussian state and Ruhr society operated on quite different levels. Yet occasionally Spencer offers tantalizing bits of information suggesting that the gap may not have been so very great. It would, for example, be most interesting to learn more about the circle of "concerned citizens" who frowned on "working-class excesses" (p. 68) and about "defenders of respectability" who objected to tavern entertainment (p. 71). For the years after 1890 she writes of growing cooperation between officials and city elites to strengthen the police in order to meet "bourgeois expectations relating to urban order and security" (p. 89). Elitist paranoia may have found a stronger echo than Spencer suggests.

At the turn of the century there occurred within the Düsseldorf district a noteworthy divergence in the comprehension of appropriate controlling strategies:

employers and other urbanites clamoured for firmer police intervention to check a perceived working-class debauchery, while state officials reacted to popular entertainments with an air of unconcern informed by a new sense of confidence in the power of the state's position. State officials were more finely attuned to the probable de-legitimizing impact for the state of massive police intervention than were their urban counterparts. Within the cities administrators and employers gradually came round to the view that the state was doing a good job and that there was no need to press for local accountability of the police. Law and order was a prerogative to be exercized by the state, whose architects understood that more was to be accomplished with *violence douce* than with *force majeure*. Therefore, it also naturally behoved state officials to not forsake a long established, heavy reliance on the power of symbols: the army remained the model for the police, in such matters as general comportment, ideology, recruiting, and dress-code (spiked-helmets remained obligatory). By 1918 the mandate of the police had been much expanded beyond simply maintaining law and order to include a variety of duties in the domain of social disciplining. The organization itself was larger than it had ever been and it was more closely supervised from Berlin. Rather than initiating an unequivocal break with this *Obrigkeitsstaat* tradition, Weimar retained and built upon Prussian policing practice.

This is a clear, unpretentious study which could have been given a slightly stronger theoretical framework, as many of the issues examined are the subject of a continuing lively dialogue.

Karl Wegert
Department of History
Bishop's University

Garner, John S., dir. *The Company Town: Architecture and Society in the Early Industrial Age.* New York et Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992. iii, 245 p. 104 figures, bibliographie, index. 55,95 $ (can.) [cartonné].

C'est une collection fort intéressante d'articles sur les «villes de compagnie» que nous livre cette publication parue récemment chez Oxford University Press. Les différentes contributions, à l'exception de celle de Leland Roth, sont issues d'une session organisée sur le sujet par le professeur Garner dans le cadre d'une rencontre de la Society of Architectural Historians tenue à Boston en avril 1990.

Si l'on s'entend généralement pour définir la ville de compagnie comme un petit centre urbain développé et controlé par une seule entreprise industrielle, il n'en demeure pas moins que cette notion recouvre des réalités bien différentes selon l'activité économique dominante (extraction, transformation ou fabrication), selon le lieu et l'époque et enfin selon le degré d'implication de la compagnie dans l'aménagement urbain et dans l'encadrement de la vie sociale des travailleurs. C'est le mérite de cette publication de nous faire saisir à la fois les traits communs et la grande diversité de formes qu'a prise la ville de compagnie en Occident. À travers des exemples choisis tant en Europe que dans les Amériques, on rend compte de la construction de ces établissements urbains dans leur contexte industriel et géographique en portant une attention spéciale à la planification plus ou moins grande dont ils ont été l'objet, à l'architecture industrielle et résidentielle et, à des degrés divers, à la vie sociale de ses habitants. De nombreuses figures, cartes, plans de ville, photos, dessins d'époque, illustrent les différents styles architecturaux ainsi que la structuration de l'espace de ces sites urbains.