

reorganization had upon the trust's scheme. The creation of Regional Councils placed the tiered local government authorities in competition with each other for power and activity. Through the 'Joint Revolving Fund' the regional councils contributed money to the LHIS scheme in their area thus demonstrating their desire to create a clearly defined and influential role in their area.

The example of Dysart during the 1960s is used to illuminate the way in which conservation was interwoven with the contemporary needs of the burghs. Revealing the climate of change, Watters and Glendinning show the importance of balancing old and new buildings during the modernist architectural era. The climate had changed by the 1980s and 1990s as the Trust returned to the communitarian aspirations of the inter-war years. The Forres project in Moray restored housing for occupation by housing association tenants. This scheme showed that rehabilitation of historic buildings could provide accommodation at affordable prices for the less affluent. These case studies therefore offer an insight into the changing motivations for conservation and place these motivations into their historical context.

Overall, Watters and Glendinning have produced a focused narrative on the evolution of the LHIS. The comprehensive nature of the book in lucidly drawing out the complexities of managing conservation and illustrating the significant role of both the NTS and LHIS makes a valuable contribution to academic literature on conservation and reminds us that more research is needed on the everyday and the familiar architecture that is often overlooked in favour of landmark buildings. Watters and Glendinning's book is a welcome, constructive and beneficial contribution to the literature on conservation and urban regeneration.

Rebecca Madgin

Centre for Urban History, Leicester

Howard Gillette, Jr, *Camden after the Fall: Decline and Renewal in a Post-Industrial City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005. xv + 323pp. Bibliography. \$39.95.
doi:10.1017/S0963926807334536

In 2002, Father Michael Doyle took a look around Camden, New Jersey, an industrial city across the river from Philadelphia, and shook his head. 'There's a sadness in me about how the lives of the people of Camden are so abused', he said. 'There's no real national ache or pain over the urban body bag count. We have to ask ourselves how this could happen in a country such as this' (p. 156). Doyle's lament could serve as the chorus for Howard Gillette's richly textured new book about Camden. Again and again, residents and public officials – their complex motives run from the civic-minded to the selfish – tried to save the city from ruins. Again and again, they could not. But like Sisyphus, they keep trying to push that rock up the hill.

Gillette begins with a familiar riff in urban history. At the end of World War II Camden was a robust, fully functioning working-class city. Its multi-ethnic workforce had access to good jobs and decent housing in tightly knit neighbourhoods. Then things fell apart. Capital fled. Italian, Irish, Polish and Jewish workers and shopkeepers bolted. By 1970, Camden was the third poorest city in America. Work was hard to find and so were re-investment dollars. The

African American and Puerto Rican families left on the streets in the shadows of the shuttered factories had few choices and fewer resources. As opportunities evaporated, crime rose. Frustrated with their grim prospects, locals protested. Some rioted. After the stores burned, they had even less as investors shied away from this volatile and violent city.

Usually urban historians end their stories at this point. Transformation from brawny working-class city to ghost town is the end point – the metaphoric death – in most of these narratives. But this is not Gillette's path. He spends most of his book talking about what happened after the factories and white families pulled up stakes from Camden. In many ways, this story of doomed efforts – one after another – is an even sadder tale than the familiar chronicle of decline and flight. 'Cumulative changes', Gillette writes, 'left Camden with the worst of all worlds – inadequate services, high taxes, and undesirable environmental conditions – [and] undercut even the best efforts to make the city a preferred place of residence once again' (p. 146). The same factors turned the city, in a sense, into a beggar, and we all know that beggars can't be choosers. By the dawn of the 1970s, Camden had no bootstraps to pull itself up by; it had, in other words, a painfully narrow tax base and almost no industry. Under these circumstances, local leaders felt like they had to listen when suburban areas asked to dump their trash there, or when state officials proposed building a prison there, or when yet another developer came up with a plan for loft condos there. And again, this is Gillette's story.

Displaying imagination and tenacity, community activists and elected officials tried to cope with decline and limited resources. Within these efforts, Gillette detects some patterns. From the federally sponsored urban renewal efforts of the 1960s to the private investment plans of recent years, two main approaches dominated post-industrial renewal strategies in Camden and elsewhere. One looked to re-build battered neighbourhoods, to bring back industry and improve housing and city services for existing residents. The other tried to turn the city into an entertainment (and to a lesser extent medical and educational) zone for middle-class visitors and newcomers and let the money they spent trickle down to the poor. One area, however, where Camden has been successful is meds and eds. For the last twenty years, Cooper Medical Center and Rutgers-Camden, where Gillette teaches, have steadily expanded. Gillette is too keen an observer of Camden not to have noticed this, but still, he could do more with this phenomenon, perhaps comparing Camden to Pittsburgh and Birmingham. Yet overall Gillette has it right – policy options bounced back and forth between rebuilding for the people there and rebuilding it in hopes of attracting new people.

For the most part, the lure of bringing suburbanites back to Camden – as guests and residents in gated communities and guarded sectors – has held the most sway. Over the last two decades, state officials have placed an aquarium, a new minor league baseball stadium and an outdoor music venue along the city's waterfront. More recently, the state offered a comprehensive bail-out for the city, a story Gillette tells with precision, but, in the end, it was so concerned with fiscal restraint that little was left for ailing neighbourhoods. Law suits, some of them quite creative, trying to get the suburbs to pay their share have also stumbled. The latest scheme for Camden envisions a sparkling new suburb within the city. A particularly audacious developer wants to lay a championship golf course with new homes lining the fairways over Camden's old industrial grid. To me this aggressive land-grab – all the property is within easy eyesight of the Philadelphia skyline – seems like a

cruel joke. But Gillette – to his credit – has a cooler head. He repeats the story and evaluates its prospects. But still *Camden after the Fall* remains a morality play, albeit a quiet one. As he wraps up the book, Gillette makes a plea and an argument. Only a regional solution will save Camden and other mouldering industrial cities. For years, the suburbs have sucked the life out of the city, dumping their trash and prisoners and unwanted public housing on its dusty remains, while keeping their schools and housing off limits to black and brown people stuck in the ghetto. But the rules of the games will have to change or Camden might yet die. To bring back Camden, suburbanites will have to give up some of their money and some of their racial and geographic privileges. Nothing else, Gillette insists, can bring Camden back. What is more, he says, it is not just the right thing to do; it is in suburbanites' best interests to shift gears. But will the residents of Cherry Hill and Haddonfield hear his call? Will the lawmakers in Trenton listen? We can hope they do. Gillette has done his part.

Bryant Simon

Temple University