ing them because of their apparent lack of significance or effectiveness. The absence of any thorough discussion of immigration and race is more serious. American city planning grew up during a period of increasing anti-immigrant bias that resulted in federal immigration quotas in the 1920s. It was not a coincidence that cities that embraced zoning had substantial, growing immigrant populations. Moreover, the initial goal of zoning was racial segregation, rather than control of use conflicts or overbuilding. Baltimore (1910), Richmond (1911), Atlanta (1913), and other cities adopted racial zoning ordinances.² (Peterson mentions race briefly in a discussion of Harlan P. Kelsey's plan for Greenville, South Carolina, where Kelsey "pleaded for racial segregation in residential areas.") A complete treatment of early American city planning needs to account for regional and social factors as context and motives for the movement.

The Birth of City Planning in the United States is an important book for the heritage field because groundwork laid in the early years of the planning profession continues to influence the survival of historic resources throughout the nation. The book also defines the types of planning heritage that can be found in the nation’s cities and towns, which may be worthy of documentation, preservation, and interpretation.

Stuart Meek
American Planning Association


In this fine book, Alexander von Hoffman chronicles the near death and amazing revival of depressed inner city areas in several of the nation's largest cities: New York, Boston, Chicago, Atlanta, and Los Angeles. Inner city neighborhoods, home to important architectural and cultural landmarks, were nearly abandoned in the 1970s after government-sponsored urban renewal, public housing, and other urban-oriented programs of the 1950s and 1960s failed to reverse their decline. In the following decades, through a number of fortunate experiments, these neighborhoods were reclaimed and reborn. How this happened holds lessons for urban areas in the United States and other countries.

A professor at Harvard University's Graduate School of Design, von Hoffman provides historical background to this riches-to-rags-to-riches saga. He summarizes the accelerating forces of decentralization after World War II and the sequence of national legislation that sought to rebuild the inner city, such as the housing acts of 1949 and 1954. The historical perspective includes the Great Society's Model Cities Program and the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 that ended the urban renewal and Model Cities programs and replaced them with Community Development Block Grants to local governments. Additional programs included Section 8 of the 1974 act that provided funds to private landlords for families needing low-cost housing and the Urban Action Development Grant program for severely economi-
ically distressed areas. During this time, banks and insurance companies “redlined” whole sections of cities and denied the lifeblood of new investment.

Unlike the polished grey-flannel-suited professional city planners of the 1950s and 1960s, the saviors of the cities in later decades were from the communities themselves. Some were religious leaders who served the impoverished. Others were community activists or former campus radicals. The vehicle of their work was community development corporations, or CDCs. Community-based organizations were established after experience with Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) organizations that provided owner-occupied home repair loans from revolving high-risk funds provided by banks, foundations, and government sources. The Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 stimulated the creation of these loan pools because banks were required to demonstrate to federal regulators that they were serving their home communities. In 1986, the low-income housing tax credit became another critical tool for urban revitalization because it allowed developers to sell credits to investors and create large pools of capital.

The partnership and collaborative model established by NHS organizations spurred the creation of thousands of CDCs and other like-minded nonprofit community groups throughout the country. New waves of immigration, new technology-based industries, and real estate booms augmented the CDC phenomenon during the last decades of the 20th century. By century’s end, the five case study cities—New York, Boston, Chicago, Atlanta, and Los Angeles—had experienced urban renaissances and were in a position to market themselves to new investors and the middle class.

The author examines these cities for the unique contributions that each made to late 20th-century urban rebirth. In the 1970s, the South Bronx was an icon of America’s worst slums. Ten years later, the Bronx was coming back to life, thanks to the efforts of charismatic people like Father Louis Gigante, who used a nonprofit organization and government funds to redevelop and manage apartment buildings and build new single-family homes. The development of Charlotte Gardens, a subdivision of prefabricated ranch houses plunked down in the middle of the South Bronx, revealed that the borough still possessed life. These faint stirrings became more pronounced as major foundations, such as Ford and Rockefeller, provided financial support and Mayor Ed Koch’s Ten Year Plan committed the city to 250,000 new units of housing for the poor and working classes. The Local Initiatives Support Corporation and the Enterprise Foundation worked with CDCs to raise large sums of money from corporations, largely through investments in low-income housing tax credits, and transformed relatively small CDCs into highly experienced housing developers.

In Boston, as von Hoffman describes, a thriving economy in the 1980s and a rising real estate market influenced the reclamation of the city’s central core. Taking advantage of these trends, community activists established CDCs to rebuild housing and revive commercial life in older neighborhoods of Roxbury and Dorchester. CDC organizations also addressed arson, health care, grocery stores, crime, and drugs as part of establishing safe urban villages. The State of Massachusetts created its own programs of loans, grants, and consultations, and helped underwrite CDCs. As major rehabilitation projects were undertaken and new residents arrived, government and banks increased their belief in the ability of CDCs to turn the tide in low-income areas. After 20 years of collaboration, an enduring relationship cemented between private community-based organizations and public and private funding sources. Despite successful results, none of Boston’s community revitalization achievements were preordained. Rather, positive developments were marked by years of experiments and setbacks.

Chicago’s South Side (south of the Loop and north of the University of Chicago) was nearly forgotten
in the post-World War II years. The author recounts how, as older buildings were demolished, high-rise public housing was erected or lots were left empty. Revival of the area hinged on the rediscovery of African American historic, architectural, and musical legacies and collaboration with large institutions, like the Illinois Institute of Technology, the city of Chicago, and major foundations. Designation of historic buildings in the Black Metropolis-Bronzeville district provided official recognition to the area and made historic buildings eligible for federal tax incentives. With the success of new housing projects south of the Loop and demolition of high-rise public housing blocks starting in the 1990s, city and community leaders anticipate that vacant lots in the South Side will be developed with new housing and, over the long haul, serve as the engine for reviving a long neglected area.

Atlanta personifies the opportunities of boomtown cities of the Sunbelt, although it traces its roots back to the mid-19th century. In the late 20th century, Atlanta exhibited many of the urban ills that proved resistant to government and corporate intervention. Several events of that period, however, offered new promise. For von Hoffman, the most important of these was the 1996 Summer Olympic Games. Planning an international event prompted the city to improve its transportation and public works infrastructure and revitalize inner-city neighborhoods. Dressing up the city involved building new facilities for sporting events and improving neighborhoods that would be seen by international visitors. In the rush to create “civic showpieces,” however, historic buildings were demolished and replaced with new housing. A notable exception, in the Old Fourth Ward, the childhood home of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. served as the centerpiece of a renewed Auburn Avenue district redeveloped through a “block by block” strategy of rehabilitation and new construction. An enduring effect of the Olympics was corporate and foundation funding for CDCs and similar organizations. The Olympics also spurred a back-to-the-city movement that lured middle-class residents to downtown lofts, former factory buildings, and older houses.

Los Angeles became one of the nation’s most important immigrant gateways in the 1980s. The flood of immigrants who poured into the city established small businesses. The dispersal of these enterprises across the metropolitan area shaped urban revitalization. The author describes these as “hidden hives of business activity.” Rather than organizing communities by area, community development officials engaged in what the author calls “creative unorthodoxy.” Constituents were organized by interests, regardless of location, and included a range of ethnic and cultural groups. Community development efforts focused on pulling together business owners to share information and develop greater business networks. In order to remain relevant, African American community organizations expanded their constituency to include the Hispanic and Latino groups. Established Asian assistance groups likewise redefined the populations they served.

Los Angeles became one of the nation’s most important immigrant gateways in the 1980s. The flood of immigrants who poured into the city established small businesses. The dispersal of these enterprises across the metropolitan area shaped urban revitalization. The author describes these as “hidden hives of business activity.” Rather than organizing communities by area, community development officials engaged in what the author calls “creative unorthodoxy.” Constituents were organized by interests, regardless of location, and included a range of ethnic and cultural groups. Community development efforts focused on pulling together business owners to share information and develop greater business networks. In order to remain relevant, African American community organizations expanded their constituency to include the Hispanic and Latino groups. Established Asian assistance groups likewise redefined the populations they served.

For heritage practitioners, this book serves as a reminder that preserving historic buildings and other elements of the built environment constitutes a critical element—but by no means the only important ingredient—in a successful recipe for community revitalization. Other essentials include jobs, transportation networks, retail establishments, public schools, crime prevention, and health care. Successful community preservationists establish connections with CDCs and related organizations and work with them to advance the improvement of whole communities.

In the title House by House, Block by Block, von Hoffman sums up an incremental approach to urban revitalization that worked. Unlike the grand plans of City Beautiful architects of the early 20th century or the highly theoretical and radical city rebuilding of the 1950s and 1960s, the salvation of the nation’s great cities resulted from the agglomer-
ation of small projects initiated by locally based community organizations in the last decades of the 20th century. The process was a gradual one, undertaken with small steps with few guideposts to mark the way. In the end, a gradual process was the best approach, one that could withstand the test of time and ensure the preservation of the nation's urban legacy.

Antoinette J. Lee  
National Park Service

**Capital Losses: A Cultural History of Washington's Destroyed Buildings**


The 1979 publication of James Goode's *Capital Losses: A Cultural History of Washington's Destroyed Buildings* was groundbreaking and helped to raise awareness of the destruction of many noteworthy District of Columbia buildings since World War II. As a history teacher at George Mason University, and later as a curator at the Smithsonian Institution, Goode personally witnessed the loss of dozens of landmarks. In the first edition, Goode examined significant buildings that had been lost, ranging from federal-style buildings of the 1790s to landmarks of the Modern style of the 1930s.

Goode’s book served as a call for preservationists to step forward and ensure the preservation and management of the city’s architectural legacy. Since its initial publication, public awareness of historic preservation has risen, and the passage of the Historic District and Historic Landmark Protection Act of 1978 has significantly slowed loss. The destructive process has not ended, however; instead, it has warranted the publication of a second edition. The new edition encompasses the original 242 structures, and adds 18, including Valley View, a historic country home, razed in 2001.

The format of the second edition is identical to the first, with lost structures organized in two groups: residential and nonresidential. The groups are further divided into 19 categories based on architectural style. The categories include commercial buildings, row houses, temporary government buildings, and, perhaps most intriguing, street furniture, such as lampposts, streetcar tracks, and gates.

One of the book’s strengths is the clear and concise narrative that includes a description of each building or feature, what made it significant, an overview of its history, and the circumstances of its destruction. Goode manages to convey the key data in a straightforward manner, without excessive technical jargon. Generally, the entry for each building and feature is limited to one page, although some merit multiple-page extended histories.

Each entry includes at least one photograph. Some entries include other images, such as owners, interiors, or context. The photographs complement the narratives and provide stirring visual reminders of what was lost. The large format of the book allows each photograph to convey important details of each structure. In addition to photographs, the book includes architectural plans and other related items.

Another useful aspect is the foreword by architectural historian Richard Longstreth, entitled “Capital Gains, Capital Challenges: Historic Preservation in Washington since 1979.” Longstreth examines the trials and tribulations of historic preservation in Washington since the 1978 preservation act, an often sobering overview. While the act preserved many structures, its weaknesses have resulted in some tragic losses and some appalling...
CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship
Summer 2005
ISSN 1068-4999

CRM = cultural resource management

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship is published twice each year by the National Park Service to address the history and development of and trends and emerging issues in cultural resource management in the United States and abroad. Its purpose is to broaden the intellectual foundation of the management of cultural resources. CRM Journal is edited in the offices of the National Center for Cultural Resources, National Park Service, in Washington, DC.


Guidance for authors is available online at http://www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal.

Manuscripts, letters to the editor, and all questions and recommendations of an editorial nature should be addressed to Antoinette J. Lee, Editor, email Toni_Lee@nps.gov, telephone (202) 354-2272, or fax (202) 371-2422. Incoming mail to the Federal Government is irradiated, which damages computer disks, CDs, and paper products. These materials should be sent by a commercial delivery service to Editor, CRM Journal, National Park Service, 1201 Eye Street, NW (2251), Washington, DC 20005.

Views and conclusions in CRM Journal are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the U.S. Government. Acceptance of material for publication does not necessarily reflect an opinion or endorsement on the part of the CRM Journal staff or the National Park Service.

CRM Journal is produced under a cooperative agreement between the National Park Service and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers.

To subscribe to CRM Journal—

Online http://www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal
email NPS_CRMJournal@nps.gov
Facsimile (202) 371-2422

U.S. Mail—
CRM Journal
National Park Service
1849 C Street, NW (2251)
Washington, DC 20240-0001