

Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Whitehand, J.W.R. *The Changing Face of Cities: A Study of Development Cycles and Urban Form*. The Institute of British Geographers Special Publication Series. No. 21. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987. Pp. viii, 189. Figures and Index. \$68.75

Richard Harris

Volume 17, numéro 1, june 1988

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1017706ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017706ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (imprimé)

1918-5138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Harris, R. (1988). Compte rendu de [Whitehand, J.W.R. *The Changing Face of Cities: A Study of Development Cycles and Urban Form*. The Institute of British Geographers Special Publication Series. No. 21. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987. Pp. viii, 189. Figures and Index. \$68.75]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 17(1), 50–51. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017706ar>

incompatible views to explaining the trend. To provide comparative depth, Choko looks at the different experience in Montreal, which has traditionally had a notably lower percentage of owner-occupied housing.

Dennis, who teaches at University College, London, was at the time of the conference, a visiting research associate at the Centre. As he put it: "Given my own background, I have chosen to compare the market in Toronto with that in Britain, rather than, as is currently fashionable, to examine parallels and contrasts with the United States." Like other of his colleagues in the New World, both past and present, Dennis is skeptical about the apparent Anglo-American bias towards owner-occupied housing. (One also has the impression that his skepticism has been strengthened by Margaret Thatcher's recent efforts to import the bias into the United Kingdom.) He notes that a key variable in the home ownership boom of the late 19th and early 20th centuries in Toronto was an unusually short supply of rental housing in a rapidly growing city. In pursuing this explanation, he points a finger at the broader "business strategies" of a small and integrated group of large landlords, whose partnerships included financial and familial elements.

Harris, on the other hand, sees Toronto under the more general rubric of the the "North American City." He too observes the tight rental market at the turn of the century, but stresses the demand rather than the supply side of the home ownership boom. For several different kinds of families in the rapidly growing city, the owner-occupied "home and the domestic economy it contains" held out advantages that rental housing could not match. He is particularly good at showing the different advantages that the home ownership boom offered different elements in the urban social structure. He illustrates how "self-building" on cheap lots at the suburban fringes of the city (especially by working-class immigrants from Britain) made the boom much more than a traditional middle-class phenomenon. He

also links this side of the story with early suburbanization trends in the Toronto manufacturing sector.

Choko's paper deals with both the narrow question of why Montreal did not experience the same boom in home ownership during this period, and the broader question of why home ownership has played a comparatively modest role in the 20th century growth of the city. Choko expresses pronounced skepticism towards explanations stressing French/English Canadian cultural differences. He notes that the experience of Montreal, not Toronto, has the most in common with that of New York, London and Paris (as opposed to Halifax, Winnipeg and Vancouver). He suggests "it may be as much through an analysis of why Torontonians became owner-occupants to such a large extent, as through explaining why Montrealers did not, that we will start to properly understand the different processes involved."

All three papers, in their own way, stress the crucial importance of additional comparative research regarding trends in Canada, the United States and Europe. All three make it clear that there are several "different processes involved" that must be taken into consideration before a full explanation can be posited. Each presents interesting data, that, when taken together, point convincingly at some important examples of the relevant processes at work. There may be others, however. Harris, for instance, while considering the role of the emerging urban, middle-class (without servants), omits discussion of the cultural ties between them and the American agrarian/frontier democratic tradition. None of the papers explicitly considers the extent to which the North American owner-occupied single family home is the urban successor of the rural family farm of the frontier era.

Such questions will have to be addressed before the whole story is told. Until then, Dennis, Harris and Choko have defined some provocative research questions and

have shed light on an intriguing aspect in the growth of Canadian cities.

Randall White
Toronto, Ontario

Whitehand, J.W.R. *The Changing Face of Cities: A Study of Development Cycles and Urban Form*. The Institute of British Geographers Special Publication Series. No. 21. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987. Pp. viii, 189. Figures and Index. \$68.75.

The landscape of the city reflects the way of life of its inhabitants. In contemporary Canadian cities, for example, the separation of home from work embodies a separation of paid from unpaid labour and a marked division by gender. Cities both reflect and facilitate our way of life, so it is not surprising that most urban historians and geographers have long shown at least passing interest in the subject. Only a few, however, have treated the development of city form as a matter to be examined in its own right.

The Changing Face of Cities is an attempt to systematize thinking on the subject. The author, a geographer in Birmingham, England, builds on a tradition of morphological research that originated in Germany and that has been most prominently developed in English language literature by M.R.G. Conzen. This branch of urban geography emphasizes the uniqueness of place. While acknowledging this, Whitehand extends the tradition by attempting to discern general patterns and processes in landscape development.

Cities do not grow steadily, but in more or less regular bursts of activity. Accordingly, Whitehand builds his framework upon an analysis of building cycles (Chapter 2). Using evidence from a variety of countries, he shows that such cycles often complement rather than mirror more general economic trends, and that they are themselves composed of discrete elements. Booms and

busts in private sector activity (notably residential construction) are typically more extreme than those in the public sector. As a result, the sectorial composition of building activity varies systematically over time, with public uses most significant during depressions. Since cities grow outwards, we might expect that rings that were developed during the depressions are likely to contain a higher proportion of public uses, including parks. Whitehand presents evidence to suggest that such has often been the case, and argues that it can readily be explained in terms of the operation of the land market (Chapter 3).

Within this overall context the author argues that the timing of building cycles, and the particular details of urban morphology, depend, in part, on changes within the building sector itself (materials and technology) and, in part, upon innovations in methods of trading and manufacturing, transportation and the public regulation of land use (Chapter 4). Many issues that resist summarization are introduced under these headings. In his analysis of fringe-belt development, Whitehand further complicates the argument by showing that once a ring or district of the city has been developed under a certain (mix of) land use, a variety of forces typically conspire to keep it that way (Chapter 5). These general arguments are then elaborated by an analysis of the growth of residential districts and commercial cores (Chapter 6 and 7).

Lucid, logical and concise, *The Changing Face of Cities* provides a useful framework in which a great deal of research on city-building may be fitted. Whitehand has elucidated the linkages between long-run economic cycles, the operation of the land market, and the form of the city. To be sure, the tactic of discussing building, industry, transportation and land use planning under the single heading of "innovation" does seem rather forced. The specific issues that he discusses are certainly important, but need to be conceptualized in relation to one

another and, ideally, be incorporated into a broader socio-economic theory. Even so, the author has clarified ways in which the urban form reflects social change.

What the author has not done is to show why urban landscapes matter. Echoing Conzen, he states, in two brief paragraphs on page 2, that the fabric of the city helps us to orient ourselves in space and time, and that it has intrinsic aesthetic value. These assertions are reasonable enough, but they are surely not exhaustive and, when stated so baldly, will not convince any but the converted. If we are to study urban landscapes in that way, and in the detail that Whitehand recommends, we must know more about the effect of the landscape on the way people live. We need anatomies of the urban cadastre. But to understand fully how cities develop, the flesh of interpretation must be put upon these analytical bones.

Richard Harris
Department of Geography
University of Toronto

Gilje, Paul A. *The Road to Mobocracy: Popular Disorder in New York City, 1763-1834*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1987. Pp. xviii, 315. Maps, figures, tables, 19 plates and index. \$32.50 (U.S.).

Urban history often seems less a clearly defined field than a controlled locale to study familiar themes. Recent works on ante-bellum American cities, for example, have explored partisan activity, social structure, ideology and community building. Paul Gilje's reworked dissertation on popular disorder plays against New York City's general socio-economic backdrop from pre-revolutionary disturbances to the time of Andrew Jackson.

Gilje argues that New York City is a case study in America's departure from 18th century conceptions of a corporate society. In the late colonial period, the ruling class

condoned riots that defended community values. Mob violence, therefore, had a limited, ritual quality. But by the 1830s Americans viewed society as collectivity of interests. Individualism and a competitive market economy dissolved the corporate ideal. Ethnic, religious, racial and class antagonisms in an impersonal city had replaced the intimacy of colonial times. Riots now exposed ugly, even murderous impulses. Gilje suggests that America's republican experiment to balance order and individual rights tilted towards order, as urban authorities quelled disruptions forcibly through the use of police powers. With the loss of social consensus, public disorder became a species of crime that expressed the particular interests of those perpetrating the disturbance.

The author effectively uses his sources to plot riots on city maps and produce lists of participants. He also traces, where possible, the social composition of the mobs and their purpose, as well as neatly categorizing the various disorders. His colourful recreations evoke cobblestone culture, whether dealing with the colonial ritual of the charivari, riots precipitated by grave-robbing doctors, St. Patrick's Day brawls, or the Callithumpian New Year's parade. In other cases, national politics, racial hatred and sectarian antagonism fueled disturbances that conjure the spectre of mobocracy for city authorities.

After 1800, the middle-classes recoiled from unbridled liberty as the population of New York became increasingly pluralistic. The Irish, an almost invisible minority in 1800, dominated the "Five Points" area in Ward Six, an increasingly dangerous enclave, by 1820. Vicious brawls flared on Irish holidays as "natives" assaulted those they derided a "Paddies." The Irish even fought among themselves. In 1824, Orangemen and Catholics bashed each other in the Greenwich Village riot, foreshadowing the intolerance that came into sharp focus with the rise of the Native American Association