

Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Ruble, Blair A. *Second Metropolis: Pragmatic Pluralism in Gilded Age Chicago, Silver Age Moscow, and Meiji Osaka*. Washington, DC, and Cambridge: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Cambridge University Press, 2001. Pp. xvii, 464. Illustrations, bibliography, index. US\$34.95 (hardcover)

J.-Guy Lalande

Volume 33, Number 1, Fall 2004

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1015684ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1015684ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (print)

1918-5138 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Lalande, J.-G. (2004). Review of [Ruble, Blair A. *Second Metropolis: Pragmatic Pluralism in Gilded Age Chicago, Silver Age Moscow, and Meiji Osaka*. Washington, DC, and Cambridge: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Cambridge University Press, 2001. Pp. xvii, 464. Illustrations, bibliography, index. US\$34.95 (hardcover)]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 33(1), 62–63. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1015684ar>

All Rights Reserved © Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine, 2004

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

of authors are brought into play to compose Blum's argument about why cities matter.

I will not do justice to the richness of Blum's argument about the potential importance of the city. What I took from his argument is that the city is a possible site for collective identity and, from that, collective action. The imaginative structure of the city "refers to the ways in which any city is conceived as orienting to the recognition, persistence, and maintenance of its difference as a feature of its routine problem-solving" (40). The problem-solving is about the mundane activities of daily life in the city but also about the big questions about existence. "The city is the place where (and it is a place because) the end of collective life is taken up as a question releasing experimentation and resistance, conflict and enmity. In taking up such questions, the city serves as a locus of collectivization for its civilization" (298).

As Blum relates culture back to problem-solving ("the notion of culture at its best makes reference to collective problem-solving in situations that are fundamentally destabilized" [19]) the culture of cities can be looked at in the production of new norms and in the ways in which this production serves as a locus of collectivization, as a potential site for collective action.

The different settings Blum examines in order to look at the production of new norms demonstrate the broad range of his analysis. To mention only a few that I found particularly interesting: cosmopolitanism (and parochialism), scenes, and nightlife all provide perspectives for Blum to analyze the ambiguities of the material and ideal dimensions of the city, and the ways these interact in the expression of distinctiveness. Cosmopolitanism and parochialism are both parts of all great cities, and Blum returns to his metaphor of the two-headed city, "both universal and local at the same time" (140). The analysis of "scenes" also plays on the idea of ambiguity—a scene is both art and commodity, pleasure and function, "as both a way of doing business and as an exciting departure from the routines of doing business" (188).

I found the discussion of nighttime particularly interesting, in part because of recent policies introduced in European cities looking at the 24-hour city. Blum concludes his analysis of nighttime and the expression of distinctiveness by asking whether globalization is turning all cities into identical 24-hour cities. And his answer, in the negative, suggests that "such specificity appears as those sorts of relations and observable practices through which cities mark the beginning and ends of their nights" (161). This describes very nicely the ways in which some cities have indeed been acting collectively to put into place programs and policies that take into account the 24-hour city, whereas others have not. As Blum says, global factors play out in all cities, but the reactions are not identical from city to city.

At the same time, this discussion of nighttime highlights for me the limits to *The Imaginative Structure of the City* or, rather, what I found disappointing about the book. With some exceptions, there is little about real cities, and after reading the book,

I did not feel that I knew more about Toronto's expression of its distinctiveness or Berlin's particular way of expressing the objectives of collective life. However, I do have some new and interesting ideas about locations where the distinctiveness of specific cities could be expressed, and also how they could be examined. In addition, the book does succeed in building the intellectual argument that the expression of distinctiveness is possible, and important, for a city, even with globalization, and thus justifies our wanting to understand the particular expressions of a particular city's identity. And that certainly is a worthwhile project.

Caroline Andrew
School of Political Studies
University of Ottawa

Ruble, Blair A. *Second Metropolis: Pragmatic Pluralism in Gilded Age Chicago, Silver Age Moscow, and Meiji Osaka.* Washington, DC, and Cambridge: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Cambridge University Press, 2001. Pp. xvii, 464. Illustrations, bibliography, index. US\$34.95 (hardcover).

Although the products of very different cultures and nations, Osaka ("Kitchen of the Country"), Moscow ("Russia's Calico Heart"), and Chicago ("Porkopolis") shared a common experience of inclusive politics during the years 1870–1920. In a superb study, Blair A. Ruble (Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies) perceptively argues that, in an era of capitalist industrial development, spectacular demographic growth (largely the result of in-migration), and deep social diversity and fragmentation, an inclusionary approach to municipal governance—what he calls "pragmatic pluralism"—could (and did) advance community interests. Indeed, three positive examples—port revitalization in Osaka, the battle for public control over transit contracts in Chicago, and adult education policies in Moscow—illustrate how the pragmatic politics of compromise produced policy outcomes that, although still imperfect, improved the quality of life of city inhabitants in a meaningful way. The key to success here was that civic leaders and politicians, in particular Nikolai Alekseev, Seki Hajime, and Carter H. Harrison—both father and son—"accepted complexity, viewing urban management as a process rather than a series of finite policy results" (36). Contrariwise, three negative examples—housing and sanitation reform in Moscow, social welfare policies in Osaka, and charter reform in Chicago—fell prey to deep-seated contradictions and conflicts that a pragmatic search for compromise could not subdue.

But how convincing is it to explain essentially everything by a commitment (or lack thereof) to tolerance, compromise, and pragmatism? Can creativity, innovation, and the practice of politics without hegemony really tell the whole story? It may very well be too simplistic to attribute, for example, the rice riots of 1918 in Osaka or the red summer of 1919 in Chicago primarily to a breakdown in the process of political accommodation. National and international factors, over which municipal rulers

had hardly any control, played a crucial role in the eruption of this violence.

An impressive bibliography that covers 77 pages attests to a remarkable research effort and a thorough knowledge of the literature on urban issues. Furthermore, a very original idea in its conception and a very meticulous tale of three cities, *Second Metropolis* raises and answers some of the fundamental questions about urbanism at the turn of the last century.

J.-Guy Lalande
Department of History
St. Francis Xavier University

Dierig, Sven, Jens Lachmund, J. Andrew Mendelsohn, eds. *Science and the City*. OSIRIS 18. 2003. Pp. v, 282. Illustrations, index.

When I was a boy on a farm between New York and Philadelphia, a trip to the city was an event. Inevitably the trips centred on museums. The museums displayed objects in grand settings: knights in armour at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Picasso and Dali at the Museum of Modern Art, classical and pre-classical antiquity at the University of Pennsylvania Museum, dinosaur bones and dioramas in the American Museum of Natural History, and all manner of mechanical gadget at the Franklin Institute. Art and science, ancients and moderns, all occupied adjacent spaces in my head. It was Civilization, while scratching out a living on a farm was Nature. But city streets and structures were forbidding and the air was foul. I was glad to return to the soil and breeze, and tumble into bed listening to sounds from the nearby forest. Whatever else may be said about cities over the past several millennia, they are places of *Kultur*; the surrounding countryside of plains and mountains, woods and waters, define *Natur*.

Civilization, a word invented in the Enlightenment, is based in cities, and it finds its antithesis in the Arcadia of Romanticism. The citizens of Paris, makers of a revolution based on reason, arrayed themselves against rustics in the countryside. Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley contrasted the teeming cities of Europe, in *The Last Man*, with the sparsely settled Alps and the frozen Arctic of *Frankenstein*. Like City Mouse and Country Mouse, 19th-century writers circulated between the culture of the city and the nature of the wild, perhaps captured most emblematically in the mathematician and historian Thomas Carlyle's migration from Craigenputtoch in Scotland, where his wife Jane could hear the sheep graze, to London, where Thomas lined his study with cork in a vain attempt to insulate himself from urban noise.

Innovative thinkers seek the city. First, there are lots of clever people to talk to and rich people to associate with. There are distractions for the flesh and the spirit. Trades useful for the advancement of knowledge—printing, illustrating, manufacturing—are readily at hand. Need to look into the cause of disease? Cities have lots of corpses. Need a translator for that paper in

Hungarian? A city is the best place for finding one. There are reversions. By the 19th century, astronomers and oceanographers seek mountain-top skies and unpolluted harbours, just as, later, enormous installations for space exploration and particle physics come to pastoral settings. And Charles Darwin, Lord Rayleigh, and Charles Sanders Peirce pursued their subtle enquiries in bucolic tranquility. But by and large modern science is a bourgeois phenomenon.

For moderns, alabaster cities, brought into being by science, would shine "undimmed by human tears." Cities animate Gandhi's and Mao's hatred of European technology, just as they offended visionaries from William Morris to Fritz Lang. In its utopian or fictional representation, science has often been abstracted from the city. Bacon's New Atlantis was located on a remote island, as was Prospero's realm; so was Dr. Moreau's laboratory and the factory of Rossum's Universal Robots. Saint-Beuve's coining of the term *ivory-tower abstraction* (an acid indictment of Romantic poet Alfred de Vigny) became a byword for the lodging of pure science—the place known today (for better or worse) as a college campus. The cities, monocular monsters lacking depth-perception, consume culture and spit out the bones; it has always required ingenuity to succeed in them. This is the condition of Polyphemos's cave, which is a trigger for Odysseus's wife. Are scientists in the city like Odysseus, thrown into an extreme setting on their way back to Arcadia? How is knowledge determined by the city? Is there, that is to say, bourgeois science, in the pregnant phrase of Lenin?

The editors of *Science and the City* contend that cities, as a congeries of material culture, determine the shape of natural science. For them, salmagundi cities force diverse things to rub up against each other, and in this way generate new ways of understanding nature. In fact they seek to dissolve the distinction between coffee roasters and azo-dye chemists, between city-street directories and imperial cartographers, between stars of the opera and stars of the heavens, between clogged urban arteries and myocardial infarcts: "One thesis of this volume is that no essential boundary separates these mundane practices of knowledge creation from scientific knowledge creation . . . [These examples of t]raffic between urban and scientific knowledge practices suggest a continuum rather than an essential difference between them" (16–17).

The collection's 13 chapters divide into two sections, one on the 19th century, and one on the 20th century. With the exception of the finest contribution, by Fan Fa-ti, all the chapters deal with the North-Atlantic world. The 19th-century section features Fan Fa-ti's study of British naturalists in Canton early in the 19th century. Fan shows how much of mainland natural history became known to Europeans through autochthonous commercial suppliers, who—in the traditional manner of the export trade—provided or cultivated what the foreigners wanted. New specimens came not from primitive accumulation by Europeans on expedition but rather through a complex commercial network where Chinese had the upper hand. Also in this