

Winter, Jay, and Jean-Louis Robert, eds. *Capital Cities at War: Paris, London, Berlin 1914–1919*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. xvii, 622. US\$90.00 (cloth)

W. John McDermott

Volume 27, Number 2, March 1999

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1016592ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1016592ar>

[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**

McDermott, W. J. (1999). Review of [Winter, Jay, and Jean-Louis Robert, eds. *Capital Cities at War: Paris, London, Berlin 1914–1919*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. xvii, 622. US\$90.00 (cloth)]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 27(2), 72–73. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1016592ar>

garde housing policy in The Netherlands, a policy that subsequently was to serve as a model for other countries in Europe.

As in other industrialized countries, the chief problems of the urban housing of underprivileged in the nineteenth century were inadequate air, light, and sunshine in the home, as well as overcrowding and lack of privacy. Poor housekeeping, the taking in of boarders to help pay the rent, the keeping of small animals in the home, and the use of the dwelling as a workplace were all undesirable practices that further aggravated living conditions for many families.

The author describes living conditions in substandard workers' dwellings in the first four chapters of her book, entitled: (1) The Politics of Daily Life, (2) Social Hygiene and Aesthetics, (3) Setting Housing Standards, and (4) Civilizing the Working Class. The contents of the remaining chapters relates to housing design, namely (5) The Standard Plan, (6) Controlling Urban Aesthetics, (7) Reforming Workers' Taste, and (8) Normalization of the Facade.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, social reformers sincerely believed that a good healthy house was not only promoting wholesomeness, but was also conducive to good domesticity and cleanliness. Thus, reformers set about to improve workers' housing conditions through the introduction of new dwelling types where daily household functions were separated from each other, e.g., washing and cooking in the kitchen, socializing in the living room, and sleeping in the bedroom, in fact, mirroring values that were the hallmark of bourgeoisie housing.

As a Montrealer, the reviewer was fascinated by two factual observations by Ms. Stieber, namely that a Catholic housing society "preferred a floor plan in which the kitchen was enlarged to a size permitting the family to dine in it, while a second, separate living room was used as a sitting room or parlor," and that "various attempts were made to achieve the goal of maximizing the number of families with their own street entrance, reducing the number of families sharing halls or stairs." It is interesting to note that although "a large multi-purpose kitchen" and "dwellings with individual entrances," are also characteristics of Montreal's indigenous workers' housing, especially in the French residential neighborhoods of the city, Montreal's so-called "multiplexes" have shared external stairs leading to upper floor dwellings.

Dutch workers, however, had apparently a deep-rooted dislike for both central entrances and internal communal stairways; they found these to be a nuisance for dwellers and non-dwellers alike. Residential buildings with such features were dubbed mere "barracks." While reluctant to share interior spaces with their neighbors, Dutch workers had no objection to sharing outdoor spaces. In fact, families preferred the so-called *hofje* (court) housing pattern, because in this type of perimeter block development children could play safely in a protected spacious outdoor public area shared by the entire community.

A remarkable housing development in the Spaarndammer district was *Zaanhof*, based on a design concept that entailed two annular parallel closed block developments with a well-defined public urban space in the center. While reflecting urban design principles advocated by Camille Sitte — an Austrian architect and planner in vogue at the time — the planning concept of *Zaanhof* is also attributed to Arie Keppler, a supervisor at the Building and Housing Inspection office, and to the architect J.M. van der Mey. However, it was H.J.M. Wallenkamp who was commissioned to design the entire interior perimeter of this housing estate. Reminiscent of a medieval town, each house has its own gable facing the public square. Vehicular access to the interior square is through two breaks in the building mass, while pedestrians had four additional portal entrances through the attached housing blocks.

There is no doubt that this scholarly book has been meticulously researched, with its findings substantiated by copious references spread over 85 pages. Unfortunately, such thorough scholarly works — especially when written in an academic style — come with a price: the general public may find the text, as detailed as it is with so many references, too daunting to read.

Municipal administrators, social workers, town planners, architects, and others who are interested in the evolution of a successful social housing policy, will find Nancy Stieber's *Housing Design and Society in Amsterdam* a good and informative read. Moreover, this handsome book should be available at every public library, as well as a welcome addition to private libraries whose owners are interested in housing design.

Norbert Schoenauer  
School of Architecture  
McGill University

---

Winter, Jay, and Jean-Louis Robert, eds. *Capital Cities at War: Paris, London, Berlin 1914–1919*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. xvii, 622. US\$90.00 (cloth).

War and social change are prominent subjects for historians interested in the cultural and social aspects of conflict, with most conceding that the First World War was the watershed of change in the twentieth century. One of these historians, Arthur Marwick, has developed a paradigm of total war's effects on society — as destructive, as a test, as demanding participation, as a vast psychological experience — applied to the national experience in several countries, especially to Great Britain. *Capital Cities at War: Paris, London, Berlin 1914–1919*, edited by Jay Winter of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and Jean-Louis Robert of the University of Orléans, self-consciously departs from this national framework to present an ambitious study of the capital cities of France, Britain and Germany during the First World War. Their departure from Marwick's approach is so complete that this innovator in the field of war and social change is

not even mentioned in this large study, either in the text or in the bibliography.

Winter and Robert set out to fill *lacunae* in both urban history and the history of the Great War: existing histories of the capitals end in 1914 or gloss over the war period; and their wartime social histories have yet to be written. These are serious omissions, argue the editors, since wars are fought and experienced at the community level, rather than as an “imagined” national experience. In the book, community means “social and geographical entities around which ordinary people construct their daily lives” (p. 4). The city is key in this concept as it is the point at which the “experienced” and the “imagined” community come together. Thus the book aims at a more realistic depiction of the experience of war by investigating its effects at the local level where Frenchmen, Britons and Germans lived their daily lives. How does this ambitious project succeed?

The book is organized into six parts — dealing with such themes as sacrifice, labour, incomes, consumption, and demography — and seventeen chapters written by several historians who are specialists in their fields. The editors are responsible for the introductory and concluding chapters, which mar this otherwise exemplary work. In a collaborative work of this kind, it is especially important that a strong introduction and conclusion focus the reader’s attention on the main goals and arguments of the work. But in this case both the introduction and conclusion tend to be vague and repetitive. The latter seems more concerned with promoting the anticipated second volume of the work than with tying together the findings of the participants in the project.

This is unfortunate since *Capital Cities at War* is an authoritative and original addition to the historiography of the First World War. The individual contributors to the study provide clear summaries of their findings which aid the reader through complex material. Thus the themes emerge: the war led to increased state intervention in areas such as housing, public health, labour supply, and the like; Berlin withstood the test of war less well than did the allied capitals; French and British administrators coped more effectively with the shortages and pressures of total war better than did their German counterparts; in Berlin, a thriving black market proved to be less fair than the controls exerted in the allied capitals; and the hardships in the German capital, coupled with the psychological impact of defeat, contributed to the problems of the Weimar Republic after the war.

Significantly, London and Paris were more successful than Berlin in creating a consensus about the level of sacrifice acceptable to their citizens and in providing an equitable distribution of food and coal. Berlin, on the other hand, suffered from bureaucratic incompetence and a corrupt black market, which produced a law-of-the-jungle approach that “made a mockery of appeals for solidarity and fair shares for all” (p. 373) (“Feeding the cities” by Bonzon and Davis; “Coal and the metropolis,” by Armin Triebel). An interesting comment on the psychological impact of war concerns “The image of the profiteer,” by one of

the editors, Jean-Louis Robert. He uses cartoons effectively “to disclose the way contemporaries juxtaposed forms of moral behaviour, personal conduct, and social comportment during the ... war” (p. 104). Focussing on material grievances, these caricatures helped to redefine the social order — capitalists vs labour, the new rich vs the ordinary patriot — matters which contributed to political discontent after the war. As Jon Lawrence (“Material pressures on the middle classes”) points out, “for the middle classes, the lottery of the wartime economy offered ... great riches for some alongside crippling losses for many others” (p. 229). In the allied capitals, however, middle-class suffering could be soothed by victory; in Berlin, no such compensation existed.

One reservation regarding the book’s treatment of its subject concerns the relative lack of attention paid to the allied blockade of Germany, which after 1916 seriously harmed civilian well-being. For instance, the blockade’s contribution to the acceleration in Berlin’s death rate from 1916 compared to the other capitals — noted by Jay Winter (“Surviving the war ...”) — is not mentioned. Yet, the experience of an effective naval blockade is a key difference between Berlin’s war experience and that of the allied capitals. Indeed, the word “blockade” does not show up in the book’s index.

In general, however, the contributors apply Marwick’s paradigm implicitly — the destructiveness of loss and material hardship, the test of governmental institutions, the participation in sacrifice of civilian populations, and the psychological impact of death and defeat — to the local level, with many of the same results. The war resulted in vast social change, and in most cases the experiences of the capitals mirrored those of the nation at large.

The overall impact of *Capital Cities at War: Paris, London, Berlin 1914–1919* is impressive, and the companion volume is eagerly anticipated. As comparative urban history, the study covers the significant themes of urban living in wartime; and as military-social history, it is a major contribution to the field of war and social development. Aside from the shaky introduction and conclusion, the book is impressively written, with many useful illustrations, tables, graphs and maps, including an appendix comprising copious statistics and tables. As one would expect, the book is thoroughly documented, and a thirty-two-page bibliography reveals a full range of primary and secondary sources in English, French and German, notwithstanding the above-mentioned omission of Marwick’s work. *Capital Cities at War*, along with its projected second volume, should be an indispensable source for urban, social and military historians for years to come.

W. John McDermott  
Department of History  
University of Winnipeg

---