Document généré le 26 déc. 2024 04:11

Urban History Review
Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Platt, Harold. *Shock Cities: The Environmental Transformation and Reform of Manchester and Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005

Stephen Booking

Volume 36, numéro 2, spring 2008

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1019179ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/1019179ar

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

Booking, S. (2008). Compte rendu de [Platt, Harold. *Shock Cities: The Environmental Transformation and Reform of Manchester and Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, *36*(2), 62–64. https://doi.org/10.7202/1019179ar

Copyright © Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine, 2008

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/

érudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

https://www.erudit.org/fr/

également leur attention sur la façon dont les Montréalais eux-mêmes en sont venus à percevoir différemment leur ville, à changer l'image mentale qu'ils avaient de celle-ci.

Ces textes charnières sont ponctués de « vignettes » (21) qui posent un regard plus ciblé sur des projets qui se concrétisent durant la décennie et les réactions auxquelles ils donnent lieu. Fidèle au genre qu'est le catalogue d'exposition, ce recueil recèle de superbes photographies, notamment celles qu'a prises Olivo Barbieri d'un Montréal vu des airs. Elles s'ajoutent à un large éventail d'illustrations sous forme d'esquisses, de croquis, de plans d'architectes et d'urbanistes, de reproductions d'articles sur Montréal, de pages couvertures de brochures touristiques et de romans, toutes publiées à l'époque.

En colligeant des textes d'une telle diversité et des illustrations d'une telle abondance, le directeur de cette collection courrait le risque de produire un ouvrage « fourre-tout » dénué de cohérence. Or, il n'en n'est rien. Toutes les composantes de l'ouvrage se complémentent de façon enrichissante: les textes, en reprenant des thèmes communs ou qui se font écho, et les illustrations, en confirmant visuellement les observations et l'analyse des auteurs. Ces derniers ont effectivement abordé le sujet munis d'interrogations précises. Les spécialistes en architecture cherchent notamment à approfondir, si ce n'est remettre en question, la façon dont on a pu rendre compte des transformations du paysage métropolitain. C'est ainsi qu'ils s'inscrivent en faux contre cette idée que l'ouverture des chantiers de construction et les réalisations innovatrices qui en découlent sont le fruit d'une génération spontanée redevable au contexte distinct de la Révolution tranquille. Comme le démontre André Lortie, bon nombre des projets mis en chantier à cette époque sont en gestation depuis des décennies. C'est le cas du métro qui est réalisé à partir de plans tracés entre les deux guerres. D'autre part, Lortie et ses collègues cherchent à faire valoir à quel point ce qui se passe à Montréal sur cette longue durée trouve son pendant ailleurs au Canada et à l'étranger. De leur point de vue : « Montréal parai(t) archétypique des dynamiques à l'œuvre dans les grandes villes occidentales après la Seconde Guerre mondiale » (78) C'est dire que Montréal a été perméable à des courants innovateurs qui dépassent ses frontières. Une telle mise en contexte permet de voir que Montréal a effectivement « vu grand » et ceci depuis longtemps. En bout de ligne, cette relecture nous oblige à nuancer, à tout le moins nous invite-t-elle à nous interroger sur ce que l'on entend par novateur lorsqu'il est question du développement urbain montréalais à cette époque.

Un début de réponse nous est offert par ces spécialistes lorsqu'ils font valoir que Montréal « offre un exemple unique ». (21) Montréal ne met donc pas simplement à exécution ce qui s'est fait avant ou ailleurs, elle innove et offre une contribution, qui lui est propre, au domaine de la conception architecturale. Dans cette même ligne de pensée, les auteurs considèrent que la contribution de l'Expo '67 est marquante. Cet événement « est le grand déclencheur de la mise en chantier de la série d'infrastructures étudiées par les service municipaux depuis plusieurs décennies » (142) et continue d'avoir des retombées significatives aujourd'hui. Evidemment, il est toujours difficile de cerner précisément la nature et la portée d'une innovation. Il n'en demeure pas moins que cette « compilation exploratoire » (21) de réflexions stimulantes, sans être concluantes, se trouve à orienter notre regard vers l'enseigne où loge la véritable innovation: non pas d'abord dans le renouveau du paysage métropolitain comme tel puisqu'il est au programme depuis longtemps et manifeste ailleurs, mais bien dans la façon dont ce renouveau est traduit en terre montréalaise.

Il est à noter toutefois que ceux/celles qui espèrent trouver ici une synthèse éclairante ou un apport nouveau à notre compréhension du contexte socio-politique de la Révolution tranquille dans lequel émerge ce « Montréal qui voit grand » risquent de rester sur leur faim. En effet, la lecture de ce contexte présenté en préface par Phyllis Lambert, directrice du CCA ainsi que par Marcel Fournier, renvoie à celle qu'ont proposée les historiens et les sociologues il y a de cela une vingtaine d'années. Il ne fait aucun doute que les débats entourant les origines et la portée des transformations sociales des années soixante continuent d'alimenter « la chronique » chez les chercheurs. Or, rares sont ceux aujourd'hui qui déclareraient avec autant d'assurance que : « L'on peut, sans contredit, affirmer que le Québec moderne naît le 22 juin 1960 avec l'élection à la fonction de premier ministre de Jean Lesage » (16) et qu'alors « tout semble avoir basculé d'un seul coup. » (31) Dans le cas de Marcel Fournier, cette interprétation est d'autant plus surprenante si l'on tient compte de sa conclusion qui elle est directement tributaire d'interprétations divergeantes plus récentes : à savoir que « tout (i.e. l'entrée dans la modernité) n'a pas commencé avec la Révolution tranquille (. . .). »(51)

Ces réserves mises à part, il n'en demeure pas moins que cet ouvrage servira de ressource précieuse pour quiconque s'intéresse de près ou de loin à l'architecture et à la réalisation des projets de développement urbain à Montréal au cours des années soixante et depuis, mais aussi ailleurs.

Nicole Neatby
Saint Mary's University, Halifax

Platt, Harold. *Shock Cities: The Environmental Transformation and Reform of Manchester and Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Alexis de Tocqueville saw it as a "monstrosity": a city where industrial revolution provoked population explosion, vast disparities in wealth, unprecedented resource consumption and endless waste. He was writing about Manchester, which with the other "shock city" of Chicago exhibited in such dramatic form the contradictions of industry. Harold Platt has written the definitive account of industrialization, transformation, and

reform in each city during the 1800s, while demonstrating the remarkable insights to be gained through comparative history.

Circumstance—site, water, coal—and well as initiatives like canals and railroads promoted Manchester and Chicago as industrial centres. With new ways of producing and organizing energy came novel industrial ecologies. Along the way, tensions between industry, human health, and the natural environment were expressed through floods, disease outbreaks, and class conflicts. Experience encouraged, but only slowly, changes in attitudes, as disasters came to be seen as more than simply "natural," and as awareness emerged of the paradox of industrial wealth creating misery.

These tensions also transformed urban geographies. As industries despoiled central Manchester, the wealthy sought suburban refuge (factory workers had no such option). The Chicago elite soon felt a similar imperative, and in both cities a patchwork of unequal amenities and exposure to hazards emerged. These patterns were often attributed to the shortcomings of the inhabitants of poor neighbourhoods themselves—a "moral environmentalism" that neglected systemic class, ethnic and religious prejudice, as well as the denial, particularly in Manchester, of basic services to poorer neighbourhoods.

But degradation and injustices eventually inspired reform, and reconsideration of the balance between civic and individual responsibilities. Poor sanitation came to be seen as less a symptom of moral weakness, than an injustice demanding organized response. Knowledge of the link between sanitation and disease strengthened reform movements by showing that the environments of the rich and poor could not be segregated so easily: germs could cross any boundary, and thus attention had to be paid to the overall health of the city and its water supply. New ideas—expressed in Benjamin Ward Richardson's "Hygeia" and Ebenezer Howard's "Garden Cities," among other works—emerged within a trans-Atlantic network of progressives, demonstrating how reform was an international phenomenon. Reform efforts prompted new roles for city governments, shifting the balance between public and private goals and roles, particularly for essential services such as water supply. But the record of reform was mixed: better water, and a better quality of life, but no effective solution for regional challenges such as air pollution.

Many factors shaped these narratives of degradation and reform. A major one was the environment itself. Manchester's abundant water for power, textile processing, and floods, and Chicago's site—a strategic but waterlogged mudhole, beside the misleadingly infinite Lake Michigan—exemplified local combinations of opportunities and constraints. The environment itself became an actor in these histories through its own obstinacy and unpredictability.

Local political cultures also played essential roles in these histories. In Manchester, hierarchy hindered environmental reform, with amenities reserved for the privileged few, and public actions long restricted to those that could turn a profit. National demands for sanitary reform would ultimately compel local response. Chicago politics were less exclusionary, yet federalism and city autonomy also gave wide scope for patronage politics—generating a preference for canals, pipelines and other engineering projects.

Platt places expertise—science applied to the urban environment—at the centre of his account. Novel insights into hydrology, chemistry, and especially germ theory compelled responses to flooding, filth, and other practical matters. Most important, bacteriology gave doctors what miasmatic theories could not: the confidence to advocate reforms based on awareness of how disease agents travel and thus the futility of insulating selected neighbourhoods from contamination.

But the authority of scientists and other experts was not itself stable. Whether engineers or doctors, chemists or microbiologists, were seen as credible depended partly on their knowledge, and also on their capacity to redefine the challenges of urban life, as when germ theory forced reconsideration of the boundaries between the body, the home, and the city. Some experts were able to act astutely in matters both political and scientific. Thus, John Rauch, first head of Chicago's Department of Health, helped create the role of urban sanitarian, embedding medical expertise within decisions about public health and the environment. Ultimately, germ theory would ultimately encourage a turn away from environmental concerns, as the individual came to be seen as the site of disease and its treatment.

Experts had to accommodate themselves to a city's political culture. Chicago engineers had clout because they knew how to build the pump works and pipelines suited to a system greased by patronage. But in Manchester's Town Hall, where deference and hierarchy ruled, scientists and doctors could enjoy a larger role. Expertise itself could also be a political resource. Reformers like Charles Rowley in Manchester and Jane Addams in Chicago shared a faith in the capacity of science to improve the city, used germ theory to challenge engineers and their technological fixes, and insisted on linking environmental justice and municipal reform.

Depth and insight make *Shock Cities* a model for urban environmental historians. Platt's portrayal of cities as energy systems provides an effective framework for understanding the relations between urban consumption and rural production—his discussion complementing William Cronon's *Nature's Metropolis.* His analysis of the industrial ecology of breweries and other industries provides fresh insights into the sites of energy and production that transformed these cities. Without neglecting the powerful forces of industrialization, political culture, and expertise, Platt also considers the inhabitants themselves, reconstructing the history of neighbourhood experience. Throughout, accounts of science, technology and medicine are embedded within social, economic and political history. And by demonstrating the relevance of water and air to

determining who rules, he demonstrates why the environment belongs at the centre of urban history.

Platt also demonstrates the enormous promise of comparative history. Comparing Manchester and Chicago—cities with different histories and political systems, but facing similar challenges of industrialization and transformation—generates otherwise inaccessible insights into the implications of political culture, the local environment, factors influencing adoption of science and technology, and the segregation of classes. *Shock Cities* is an exhaustive analysis, with implications far beyond 19th century Manchester and Chicago.

Stephen Bocking
Trent University

Teaford, Jon C. *The Metropolitan Revolution: The Rise of Post-Urban America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006. 306 pp, illustrations, notes, index. ISBN: 0-231-13372-3; paper: ISBN: 0-231-13373-1

No historian does a better job than Jon Teaford of writing overviews of periods or issues in U.S. urban history. His latest offering, *The Metropolitan Revolution,* is typical: accessible and balanced, it is a concise survey of what has been happening to U.S. metropolitan areas since 1945. For anyone who is looking for such a factual survey—and this is likely to include urbanists in a variety of fields and disciplines—this book can be strongly recommended, with two reservations.

Although Teaford does not come out and say it, *The Metropolitan Revolution* is surely intended as a text. It does not claim to offer a novel interpretation but instead traces in a generally uncontroversial way the outlines of urban change. More than many historians might, Teaford pays full attention to the shifts in economic and social geography, most notably between cities and suburbs. Appropriately, his account is broadly chronological. He opens by sketching the urban scene in 1945: the monocentric urban centre, comprehended best by sociologists of the Chicago school, when the city was dominant numerically, economically, symbolically, and also in political terms. He then traces the attempts that cities made, with the collusion of federal governments, to maintain their pre-eminence, for example through the program of urban renewal. These efforts proved to be largely ineffectual, and in many cases were overwhelmed by a combination of forces that promoted decentralization. Teaford discusses the familiar culprits: affluence, the automobile, federally-subsidised freeways and guaranteed mortgage insurance. By the 1960s the cities were in trouble, caught in a tightening fiscal vice as concentrations of the poor and minorities placed heavy demands on public services while returning little in the way of property taxes. In different ways race riots and busing speeded the flight of the middle classes, some of whom were African-American. Beginning in the 1970s, some cities began to experience a revival, most obviously expressed in gentrification. Teaford gives appropriate weight to this trend, noting that it has often been associated with a revival of the central city's economy. The clock has not been turned back, however: industry has been lost and replaced by offices or by convention and tourist facilities, often tied to sites and events of urban spectacle. But Teaford correctly emphasized that the impact of such revivals remain variable and limited. The overwhelming trend is still outwards in the form of a dispersed sprawl that continues to defy attempts to define, explain, and above all limit it.

The book has much to recommend it. There are a good number of well-chosen illustrations (although no maps); the prose is never less than serviceable; the overall structure of the book is sensible; and the narrative is outstandingly clear. Indeed, I cannot recall a book of this kind where the argument flowed so well. Teaford writes with authority, includes a substantial number of references, and makes effective use of contemporary newspaper accounts. These provide him with some nice examples and quotes that help bring the argument alive. Perhaps most impressive is the seamless way in which he moves from the early postwar period, now the subject of historical scrutiny, into the near present, still the prerogative of social scientists and policy analysts. He tends to blend rather than highlight the areas of debate but the latter are not wholly ignored. For example, he discusses the downsides of gentrification as well as the upsides, and sketches the recent critique of sprawl. Some topics receive rather less attention than they merit. Among these the changing level and geography of urban employment, and especially manufacturing is arguably the most important. And social scientists will look in vain for discussion of some of the theoretical issues that have exercised them in the past couple of decades. For example, I did not note any reference to postmodernism (either in architecture or urban design), to the 'LA School' of urban theory, or to the controversially 'cultural,' as opposed to economic, interpretations of urban consumption. *The Metropolitan Revolution* may survey the territory that is covered by social scientists but it does so in the non-theoretical way that is the norm among urban historians. In its way that is fair enough, and indeed in some respects refreshing.

One temporary and two permanent features of the book will limit its usefulness. The (hopefully) temporary is that my copy repeated pages 25–56 and omitted pages 89–120. (If, in complete copies of the book, the latter include egregious errors or dazzling perceptions then this reviewer must be excused for failing to note them.) The two permanent features include a limitation and a fault. The limitation is that Teaford offers very little discussion of the environmental consequences of metropolitan growth. A decade ago such an omission would have been understandable, if regrettable. Today, when the environmental consequences of sprawl are widely understood to be a vital issue, this omission in a broad survey is problematic. The fault is the frustrating index. Appropriately enough, the text includes discussions of downtown, suburbs,