

Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Fries, Sylvia Doughty. *The Urban Idea in Colonial America*.
Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977. Pp. xviii, 216.
\$12.50

Klaus J. Hansen

Volume 8, Number 3, February 1980

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1019371ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1019371ar>

[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

Hansen, K. J. (1980). Review of [Fries, Sylvia Doughty. *The Urban Idea in Colonial America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977. Pp. xviii, 216. \$12.50]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 8(3), 168–169.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1019371ar>

All Rights Reserved © Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine, 1980

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/>

largely reluctant population; Atlanta labour, for example, criticized progressive educational "fads."

A second characteristic common to most of America's early twentieth-century progressives was an ideology of technical expertise and state intervention. In an essay by Augustus Cerillo, Jr., New York City reformers such as Lawrence Veiller and Charles Evans Hughes are viewed as sharing a faith in administrative efficiency and bureaucracy through the use of new boards, bureaus and regulations. "The interests of the community" expressed through the state, Hughes avowed, had to take priority over individual profits. Los Angeles professionals and businessmen campaigned successfully for civil service reform and municipalization of utilities to win rationalized management of urban growth. The importance of civic technocrats, described for Los Angeles by Martin J. Schiesl, is also apparent in John F. Bauman's study of the Philadelphia Housing Commission, which established stringent housing laws and inspectorships. Michael Ebner's reform hero, mayor Frederick Low of Passaic, New Jersey, was an engineer and technical journalist with a deep faith in government intervention. Low, however, alienated corporate interests when he became an ardent single taxer and tried to increase taxes on the town's large textile industry.

Industrialization had clearly augmented economic and social divisions in American cities, and had thrown up barricades to business advance. The middle-class reformers described in The Age of Urban Reform were not Americans who wasted time agonizing over the maintenance of laissez-faire and free-enterprise myths. They used civic and state governments, as well as political associations, to intervene in a variety of problems and to secure cities more conducive to business prosperity and expansion. One of these problems was poor housing. For a Philadelphia business executive, "In order to obtain the maximum efficiency from any workman, he must have good conditions under which to live and work Health makes life and life creates property and property is the wealth of the world." Another problem was education. Atlanta reformers strove to ensure that public schools would provide vocational training to mesh with the needs of local employers. For its accounts of housing, education, and other civic facilities, and the groups which instituted them, The Age of Urban Reform is a valuable source on the modernization of American cities.

Gene Howard Homel
Department of History
Simon Fraser University

* * *

Fries, Sylvia Doughty. The Urban Idea in Colonial America. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977. Pp. xviii, 216. \$12.50.

Sylvia Doughty Fries has described and analysed the intellectual and social origins of the city in colonial America, focusing on New England

(Boston and New Haven), Pennsylvania (Philadelphia), Virginia (Williamsburg), and Georgia (Savannah) as representative examples of colonial societies that developed important cities. Not surprisingly, the founders of all these cities draw upon the cultural heritage of western civilization (a heritage the author reviews in considerable detail in chapter 1). This background was filtered through the specific values of the individual founders, leading to a variety of expectations: John Winthrop's "city on a hill," William Penn's "greene country towne," James Blair's Renaissance theater of culture and politics, and Percival and Ogelthorpe's neo-Harringtonian Roman city of civic virtue. In spite of these diverse intentions, all these founders shared the conservative goal of reconstructing in the new world a social and moral world of stability and order that they saw disappearing in a society of "vexed and troubled Englishmen."

All of them failed in their intentions. As a center of trade and commerce, Boston became the very antithesis of the city on a hill, and the shift of power "from meetinghouse to countinghouse" marked the defeat of William Penn's dreams of a traditional, hierarchical society in Philadelphia. Both cities were becoming the last thing their founders wanted them to be--secular new Londons in the new world. Ironically, though that is precisely what the founders of Williamsburg envisioned for their city, the best they could accomplish was a country-town with urban pretensions. The expectations for Savannah remained even more of a dream.

Dr. Fries' choice of cities as well as her development of the theme of conflict between the ideal and the real world inevitably lead to a comparison of her work with Daniel Boorstin's The Americans: The Colonial Experience. She cites Boorstin only once, in her chapter on Savannah, where she chastizes him (convincingly), for regarding Oglethorpe's plans as too utopian and dogmatic for implementation in the real world. Nevertheless, her book lacks the intellectual force and cohesion of Boorstin, who has captured the tension between rhetoric and reality much more dramatically and with much greater historical imagination.

Fries devotes a major part of each chapter to a discussion of the social and intellectual assumptions impelling the founders of each colony that will no doubt be useful to those unfamiliar with the extensive literature in the field. She then applies this background to a discussion of the specific plans of the respective cities. Though she has summarized some of her main ideas in a brief introduction, she does not tie her insights together in a conclusion. There is, however, a good article in this material that might make her valuable ideas more accessible to those who do not want to be bothered with a great deal of familiar background material. This is a workmanlike, useful book. Yet the blurb on the jacket to the contrary notwithstanding, the myth of the American city is still awaiting its Henry Nash Smith, Leo Marx, or Roderick Nash.

Klaus J. Hansen
Queen's University