

Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Fairbanks, Robert B. *For the City as a Whole: Planning, Politics, and the Public Interest in Dallas, Texas, 1900–1965*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998. Pp. xiii, 318. Maps, bibliography, index. US\$47.95 (hardcover)

Wilson, William H. *Hamilton Park: A Planned Black Community in Dallas*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. Pp. x, 256. Maps, black-and-white illustrations, appendices, index. US\$39.95 (hardcover)

Patricia Evridge Hill

Volume 29, Number 1, October 2000

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1016436ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1016436ar>

[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

Hill, P. E. (2000). Review of [Fairbanks, Robert B. *For the City as a Whole: Planning, Politics, and the Public Interest in Dallas, Texas, 1900–1965*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998. Pp. xiii, 318. Maps, bibliography, index. US\$47.95 (hardcover) / Wilson, William H. *Hamilton Park: A Planned Black Community in Dallas*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. Pp. x, 256. Maps, black-and-white illustrations, appendices, index. US\$39.95 (hardcover)]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 29(1), 74–75. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1016436ar>

All Rights Reserved © Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine, 2000

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/>

the urban condition, but the reader is then left to wonder about the practical import of the lessons that have been presented. We have an interesting series of individual statements, and the book fulfils its stated objective to provide a bridge between the many types of urban research now being undertaken across Canada. But then what?

John N. Jackson
Professor Emeritus (Applied Geography)
Brock University

Fairbanks, Robert B. *For the City as a Whole: Planning, Politics, and the Public Interest in Dallas, Texas, 1900–1965*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998. Pp. xiii, 318. Maps, bibliography, index. US\$47.95 (hardcover).

Wilson, William H. *Hamilton Park: A Planned Black Community in Dallas*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. Pp. x, 256. Maps, black-and-white illustrations, appendices, index. US\$39.95 (hardcover).

Two recent studies of Dallas, Texas, demonstrate the richness of contemporary scholarship in a part of the United States long ignored by urbanists and an ongoing lack of consensus on whether a city should be viewed as a “physical, economic, social, and cultural unit” or a collection of interdependent neighbourhoods and communities (3). Robert B. Fairbanks explores Dallas’s early twentieth-century leaders’ embrace of a “systems approach” to planning and problem solving. Such an approach emphasized the comprehensiveness of the city and its surrounding suburbs. This city-as-a-whole discourse broke down beginning in the mid-1950s. William H. Wilson focuses on Hamilton Park, a middle-class African-American subdivision, and builds a convincing argument for the importance of place-based communities, even as residents’ commitments to non-neighbourhood activities and ties increased in the latter half of the twentieth century.

Fairbanks wants readers to take the public discourse of Dallas business leaders seriously. He links the development of city-as-a-whole rhetoric in the 1920s to scholars associated with the Chicago School of Sociology, reformers associated with the National Municipal League, and an emerging national network of planners (40–2). Committed to urban growth, fiscal restraint, and municipal efficiency, Dallas’s commercial-civic elite organized a variety of planning organizations and used the city’s major daily newspaper to advocate council-manager government.

Chapters 3 to 5 provide a well-researched account of Citizens Charter Association (CCA) leadership in Dallas. These fine chapters detail the development and consolidation of council-manager government and tensions among business leaders. Some supported a professional city manager, while others proposed a “Dallas man” for the job. Dallas business leaders’ tendency to feud publicly and organize “sectional” factions based on the locations of their downtown businesses made a

public discourse emphasizing unity and efficiency especially appealing to a mostly middle-class, white electorate. Fairbanks traces the tightening grip of business leadership through the Dallas Citizens Council (DCC) and its focus on growth and economic development in the 1940s.

According to Fairbanks, by the 1960s public discourse in Dallas and across the nation emphasized the needs of citizens, represented by racial/ethnic, class, and neighbourhood-based groups, instead of concerning itself with the city or metropolitan region as a whole (240). But was city-as-a-whole rhetoric ever more than a cloak for the interests of a particular race- and class-based elite tied to downtown business interests? In 1959, Earle Cabell, an insider who broke away from the CCA, called the Dallas machine, “nothing more than a syndicate of downtown landlords, bankers and millionaires” (225). The public discourse that helped Dallas business leaders acquire and maintain municipal power in the 1930s and 1940s was exposed as a sham by the 1960s.

Labour organizations and black leaders who chose to cooperate with Dallas business leaders in the 1930s and 1940s did so because the alternatives (the Catfish Club and/or Ku Klux Klan-backed candidates) were even less attractive, not because they believed city-as-a-whole rhetoric (169). After an interesting discussion of the elite’s limited responses to housing shortages facing African Americans and Latinos in the 1930s and 1940s, Fairbanks asserts “the emphasis always remained primarily on the needs of the city as opposed to the needs of blacks or Mexican Americans” (163). By the 1960s, it had become clear to most everyone that city-as-a-whole was code for whatever served the needs of white business leaders and their mostly middle-class political constituents.

Fairbanks’s call for a new focus on citizens’ “responsibilities to the whole” with “sensitivity to the rights and needs of individuals, neighborhoods, and racial and ethnic groups” is undoubtedly sincere (250). It will not, however, be embraced easily by those for whom historically *city-as-a-whole* meant “exclusion.”

William H. Wilson’s *Hamilton Park* is a case study in exclusion, segregation, and the late and limited response of business leaders to an ongoing twentieth-century housing shortage for Dallas blacks. At the same time, it chronicles the development of one Dallas community whose original residents “knew what they wanted and quickly mastered the techniques of presenting their concerns” (197). Wilson uncovers both hegemony and agency. Since construction began in the mid-1950s, Hamilton Park has remained a “defended neighborhood,” even as residents increasingly find meaning elsewhere (198–9).

There is much to applaud here. Wilson recreates Hamilton Park using a variety of traditional and nontraditional sources—most interestingly city directories and interviews with fifty-eight people who either lived in the subdivision or were instrumental in its founding. Appendices explaining Wilson’s use of specific sources make the work a fine model for graduate students. Both

Wilson and Johns Hopkins University Press should be congratulated for including thirty-two black-and-white photographs that visually establish the physical neighbourhood and many of its residents. Two chapters on the Hamilton Park School accurately reflect the community's middle-class outlook and aspirations.

Wilson details an intransigent white community's objections to a series of plans to house Dallas blacks—in public housing units, new segregated enclaves, and transitional (formerly all-white) neighbourhoods in South Dallas. Protests, threats, and violence were commonplace throughout the 1940s, culminating in 1950 and 1951 with a series of bombings in south Dallas. Most African Americans in Dallas were poor, but the lack of housing for blacks was so acute that the racial-relations advisor for the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) estimated a market for almost 1,500 middle-class homes ranging from \$5,000 to \$7,500 (21).

The city's elite pursued the development of Hamilton Park in large part to quell the violence that resulted when middle-class blacks purchased homes in white neighbourhoods. Some saw support for black housing as consistent with public discourse emphasizing policies that benefited the city as a whole. It was the violence, however, and its perceived damage to the city's reputation that transformed rhetoric into action. Hamilton Park was dedicated in 1953. Construction continued until 1960. Wilson argues that, while white participation was necessary to develop the subdivision, by the end of the 1950s Hamilton Park's "destiny was in the hands of its residents, as much as a community's fate may be decided locally" (54).

Hamilton Park residents organized politically through an Interorganizational Council (IOC) that worked in tandem with the Democratic Party to bring candidates to the neighborhood and urge residents to vote. The Civic League "fought encroachments such as the lumber yard and waged a ceaseless campaign against potholes and poorly maintained property" (197). The Civic League circulated a petition in 1957 and organized visits to the park board over the next few years that resulted in playground equipment, a wading pool, a lighted baseball diamond with bleachers, a lighted tennis court, fences, trees, and sidewalks for Willowdell Park, the area's only significant recreational facility (97–8). By 1966, the city had paved all but three of the neighbourhood's back alleys. The Civic League also won street lights, stop signs, crosswalk markings, and extra police patrols to cut down on reckless driving (99–100).

Hamilton Park residents like Charles Smith who asserted, "We've always squealed and we've gotten the grease" and Mrs. Willie B. Johnson who explained, "I'd go to their meetings. . . . I asked questions" exemplify the effectiveness of Hamilton Park's organizers and the resiliency of residents (186–7). Nevertheless, city leaders refused to ameliorate frequent flooding along Cottonwood Creek and did not protect the community from adverse effects of the urban growth they vigorously pursued. In the mid-1980s, a developer offered to buy every residence in Hamilton Park for \$35 per square foot—at least \$250,000 for

houses and lots that cost about \$9,000 in the 1950s (162). The buyout never materialized, after oil prices dropped and Texas real estate lost much of its value. Commercial growth and major transportation arteries around Hamilton Park make the area ripe for redevelopment, however. According to Wilson, gentrification is unlikely, due to the small sizes of Hamilton Park's houses and lots, leaving the community "uncongenial to anything but a thorough replatting and rebuilding" (198).

Wilson concludes that Hamilton Park was a "worthwhile if inadequate response to the serious problem of housing middle-income Dallas blacks" and asserts that the segregated community thrived in ways that deserve the attention of urban historians and planners (viii). Hamilton Park is very likely doomed. Still, Wilson is correct to point out that the future does not negate the community's historical value. His well-researched and sensitive treatment reveals a model of community life that flourished for a time in an inhospitable setting. Hamilton Park's history bears witness to a community's active struggle with power, and also to the hollowness of paternalistic rhetoric.

Patricia Evridge Hill
Social Science Department
San José State University

Melosi, Martin V. *The Sanitary City: Urban Infrastructure in America from Colonial Times to the Present, Creating the North American Landscape Series*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000. Pp. xii, 578, black-and-white illustrations, photographs, bibliographical essay, and index. US\$59.95.

Martin Melosi, director of the Institute for Public History at the University of Houston, has a long and impressive record in urban environmental history. In this thought-provoking volume he presents an overview of urban infrastructure—by which he means water supply, wastewater removal, and the disposal of garbage—in the United States from colonial times to the present. More than a historical synthesis, however, the book also deals with contemporary concerns about pollution, and though Melosi avoids unnecessary alarmism, one cannot finish this important book without a renewed sense of concern for the future of our urban environments.

The book is divided into three periods, each characterized by a different environmental paradigm: the age of miasmas (colonial times up to 1880), the age of bacteriology (1880–1945), and the new ecology (1945 to the present). For each of his divisions and subdivisions, Melosi generally adopts a common format: an introductory chapter outlining the demographic, economic, political, legal, and scientific context of urban sanitation, followed by successive chapters on water supply, wastewater and sewage removal, and the disposal of solid waste. These chapters explain relevant sanitary technologies, chart their diffusion from a national perspective, and describe their application in specific