

Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Bergeron, Louis, ed., *Paris. Genèse d'un paysage*. Paris: Picard, and Rome: Laterza, 1989. Pp. 313. Illustrations, maps, black and white photographs. 420 F

Barrie M. Ratcliffe

Volume 19, Number 3, February 1991

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1017602ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017602ar>

[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

Ratcliffe, B. M. (1991). Review of [Bergeron, Louis, ed., *Paris. Genèse d'un paysage*. Paris: Picard, and Rome: Laterza, 1989. Pp. 313. Illustrations, maps, black and white photographs. 420 F]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 19(3), 240–241. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017602ar>

Bergeron, Louis, ed., *Paris. Genèse d'un paysage*. Paris: Picard, and Rome: Laterza, 1989. Pp. 313. Illustrations, maps, black and white photographs. 420 F.

Though they are certainly not the lone pioneers that apologists of the "nouvelle histoire" would have us believe, French scholars have been at the forefront of academics who transformed the historical discipline since World War II. They have been markedly less influential, however, in the renewal of urban history. Only in a limited number of areas have their contributions been noteworthy. These include the analysis of rural-urban migration flows and the accommodation and reception of migrants by the cities of early modern Europe. In these areas, French scholars such as Jean-Pierre Poussou, Jean-Pierre Bardet and Maurice Garden have led the way in the analysis of serial data in order to determine the importance and character of in-migration. Additional French contributions include the study of urban space, both the physical space that the sociologist Maurice Halbwachs early insisted should be studied not just as the creation of man—city governments, planners, architects, and speculators—but rather as the product of complex and competing forces; and lived space (what the French call *espace vécu* or *espace de vie*), or how city-dwellers perceive, adapt to, and adapt urban space. It has to be added, though, that studies of physical space have been more numerous and more successful than those dealing with lived space.

Paris. *Genèse d'un paysage*, edited by one of France's leading urban historians, deals with physical space. Addressing itself to a general audience, it aims to present the important results of recent research on the evolution of Paris's physical space. This research has used a variety of tools: archaeological digs,

cadastral and notarial materials, and more traditional archival sources, such as written, cartographic and photographic items.

The book is a timely one. Much work has recently been done on the evolution of the physical space of the French capital, its morphology, its changing use and colonization at the periphery. This research gives us a clearer understanding of the complexity both of the physical forms of the city and of the dynamics and constraints that are responsible for the rhythm of change, forces that are linked to geography, the political and judicial powers of central and city governments, property ownership and property owners, as well as the city's economy and wider regional and national processes. Paris. *Genèse d'un paysage*, then, provides an overview of the evolution of Parisian space. In doing so, it enables us to see further than the facades of monumental Paris, to see more than Haussmanization and the post-war urban planning during the "trente glorieuses" (1950–1980). Thus it is possible to perceive the matrix of common forces that have helped to make the urban landscape.

Paris. *Genèse d'un paysage* is nevertheless a disappointing work. There are three reasons why. The first relates to the book's lack of homogeneity and the appearance of the book. In an edited volume such as this there is inevitably some disparity between chapters. Thus, while Louis Bergeron and Marcel Roncayolo's analysis of urban space since 1850 (Chapter V) is sophisticated and challenging, some other chapters are less satisfactory. Jean Nagle's on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, for instance, is narrative and descriptive and is the only one of the five chapters that offers neither footnotes nor bibliographi-

cal references. To a large extent this uneven quality is understandable since contributors, whose task is to present a synthesis, are dependent on the state of research for the period they cover. Pierre Pinon could benefit from the work of Bruno Fortier, Francois Loyer, Jeanne Pronteau and others for his discussion of the period 1715–1848. Those responsible for earlier periods were not able to call on comparable riches. There are other problems of presentation that must be blamed on the team of historians and their publisher. A text that studies urban space requires that cartography be made an integral part of the discourse. The book is certainly studded with maps and plans, but they are nearly all reproductions; few of them are legible. The poverty of maps and plans in a dense analysis of streets and quarters is a more important shortcoming than the too-frequent typographical errors.

The clarity and usefulness of the analysis of the changing Parisian landscape that is presented in this book are limited for a second reason, one beyond the editor's control. Louis Bergeron admits in his preface that urban history in France—and he might have added elsewhere—remains imperfectly unified. The fact is that urban space, in its parts and in in toto, remains difficult to analyze for source, conceptual and methodological reasons. The effort to go beyond the study of the conscious actions of individuals and groups has yielded some valuable microanalyses, such as Francoise Boudon's study of the les Halles quarter, but it has given us very few macroanalyses of larger spaces. It is not surprising, then, that the work under review offers no remarkable methodological breakthroughs for the study of urban space.

There is a third and final reason that explains why this study is uneven and incomplete. It is the mirror of our improved

but still lacunar knowledge of the evolution of Parisian space. This patchiness is partly to be attributed to the kind of sources historians can use. The archival records and the physical traces of the past in contemporary Paris are infinitely richer and are more abundant for the monumental centre, for the business quarters, and rich residential areas, than they are for the periphery, for the more popular and industrial areas, many of which still survive in present-day Paris despite spreading embourgeoisement. The gaze of contributors to this volume, then, is essentially a bourgeois one, for it follows the westward movement of business and fashionable quarters and rarely turns to the eastern half of the city, more working-class and industrial. They also keep their eyes on the centre rather than the margin and, except for the suggestive analysis offered by Louis Bergeron and Marcel Roncayolo, fail to examine the ways in which successive inner suburbs acted as larders and recreation areas for Paris intra muros, dumping grounds for a variety of urban detritus, space-hungry warehouses, and insalubrious industries, only to be finally integrated, if often only imperfectly, into Parisian space.

Paris. Genèse d'un paysage, then, should be read for what it reveals about the progress made in our knowledge about the ever-changing Parisian landscape. It should also be read for what it shows about how much historians still need to sharpen the tools of analysis that will enable them to gain a fuller understanding of urban morphology.

Barrie M. Ratcliffe
Département d'histoire
Université Laval

Krumholtz, Norman and John Forester, *Making Equity Planning Work: Leadership in the Public Sector*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990. Pp. xxiii, 260. Index.

Bear, Larry Alan, *The Glass House Revolution: Inner-City War for Interdependence*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1990. Pp. 146. 30 illustrations, notes, index. \$24.95 U.S.

There is a pleasant irony in the fact that Larry Bear's insightful study of the Temple area of North Philadelphia is published by the University of Washington Press and that Norman Krumholtz's study of equity planning in Cleveland is published by Temple University Press. The two studies have a good deal in common in their focus on the problems of inner-city America, the nature of political power, the role of private corporations in urban reform, and the prospects for change. Both studies underline the impediments to reform, its urgency and the implications of failing to come to terms with one of the most pressing problems in American society today. Krumholtz's analysis of Cleveland, however, underscores the lengthy historical tradition of urban reform and the previous efforts which have been made to address the problems.

Krumholtz's account is essentially a personal memoir of the decade (1969–79) during which he served as the head of the planning staff of Cleveland under three different mayors—Carl Stokes, Ralph Perk and Dennis Kucinich. Krumholtz provides a detailed (overly detailed many readers will conclude) account of the issues that confronted planners in gaining support for their ideas in the political, community and corporate sectors of Cleveland, in particular the frustrations of planners such as

Krumholtz who were committed to the idea of equity planning—that is, planning with the specific goal of ameliorating the lives of the weaker and poorer segments of a city population.

Krumholtz divides his study into two sections. The first outlines the experience of the planning department in Cleveland in several specific issues, including the Euclid Beach development, the Clark Freeway and other regional and inner-city transportation issues, low and moderate income housing, tax delinquency and land banking, relations with community groups and other city agencies. The second part of the book attempts to apply the lessons of the Cleveland experience to urban planning in general.

Krumholtz's account stresses the absence of a clear political mandate for planners in Cleveland and the opportunity this afforded for the planning department to forge its own agenda. In some major areas, such as low-income housing, there were major defeats as they faced racism and class interests. In other areas, such as changes in Ohio's property tax laws, they experienced success.

In spite of the failures and frustrations that Krumholtz experienced during his ten years in office, there were a sufficient number of victories for him to conclude optimistically that planners can have an impact on those segments of a society which are most in need, that they can contribute to the alleviation of inequality, and that it is possible to resist the pressures of the main power blocs in any community. Krumholtz stresses that in order to make progress planners have to be conscious of both the professional and political dimensions of a planning problem. Some of their failures in Cleveland, especially in the early stages