

Bamberg rejoices at the durability of Lewis's venture. With the exception of now-mature, dutifully maintained shrubs and trees, the village in the twenty-first century stands as it did in the '30s, a tribute to the community's strict management, rigorous maintenance, and regulations against architectural modification. It is also a tribute to Lewis's careful screening of prospective tenants, his rules against pets, and his encouragement of middle-class pastimes such as tennis and bridge.

More questionable is how Bamberg sees Chatham Village influencing subsequent American community planning, including developments such as Buckingham in Arlington, Virginia; Stuyvesant Town in Manhattan; Bedford Heights public housing in Pittsburgh; and even the modern New Urbanism. Not all thrived like Chatham Village. To be successful, contends Bamberg, architect planners must build for preservation—that is, they must erect well-planned projects designed, as Chatham Village was, for a prospective class of tenants, and they must place paramount importance on maintenance and amenities.

Clearly, Chatham Village's rise in 1931–32 was indicative of the emergence of a broader genre of planned neighborhood-unit communities whose economies of scale and efficient design (and, ideally, limited-dividend financing, but more likely federal dollars) would make them affordable for the masses. It was that vision of “modern housing,” not Lewis's, that between 1933 and 1974 produced the effulgence of government-financed communities, many of which succumbed to poor maintenance, poor design, and poor management. Sadly, there were more Pruitt-Igoes and Robert Taylor Homes than Chatham Villages. Bamberg has written and University of Pittsburgh Press has produced a beautiful and nicely written saga of what good planning and good management can accomplish in housing if all the stars—the vision, the resources, and the ideal circumstances—are aligned.

*Muskie School, University of Southern Maine*

JOHN F. BAUMAN

*AFSCME's Philadelphia Story: Municipal Workers and Urban Power in the Twentieth Century.* By FRANCIS RYAN. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011. 320 pp. Illustrations, appendix, notes, bibliography, index. \$59.50 cloth; \$27.95 paper.)

Francis Ryan has written a terrific and timely book that helps us understand how and why unionized public employees remain so controversial. This well-written, extensively researched, and—while pro-labor—well-balanced monograph provides an excellent overview of the major political, economic, and demographic trends in Philadelphia from the 1930s to the early twenty-first century.

Ryan argues that class, not ethnicity, was at the center of the economics of Philadelphia's political machine; workers possessed some ability to resist urban bosses' control over an extensive patronage network. AFSCME (the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees) provides a case study of the complex ways in which workers, while racially divided, managed partially to transcend race through their shared participation in the union. As Philadelphia (and its large public sector) became increasingly dominated by African Americans, black workers assumed greater control over the organization and, thereby, the city's politics. Ryan's study thus demonstrates the importance of public unions to the rise of urban black politics and traces the ambiguous effects of these politics on the black working class.

This is a richly detailed book that lavishes attention on the pre-union world of the public worker, the fitful rise of public unionism in the 1920s and 1930s, and the increasing power and confidence of AFSCME in the post-World War II era. The union played a key role in the postbellum development of civil service reform and in Philadelphia's shift from a Republican fiefdom to a Democratic stronghold. Ryan focuses on AFSCME's militant history as well as the growing power of black workers within it. Most significant is the manner in which Ryan deals with the politics of the organization, detailing how the union interacted with the politicians of a major city in long-term economic and demographic decline. By the late 1980s, Philadelphia was in increasingly tough financial shape; it hemorrhaged population, more than one hundred thousand industrial jobs, and its tax base. Higher taxes failed to bring about fiscal health.

These dire economic trends laid the groundwork for a showdown over AFSCME's "archaic work customs," such as the refusal of custodians at city hall "to wash walls above shoulder height since it was not specified in the civil service job description" (221). In 1992, new mayor Ed Rendell provoked a short strike, the outcome of which was that he won everything he wanted. The union had been saved, but hundreds of unskilled workers lost their jobs. Ryan seems to think this setback was due to the union's leadership turning its back on its militant history, though he also acknowledges that the group's rank and file may have had neither the stomach nor the leverage to win the fight. AFSCME waged numerous battles to counteract the privatization and corporate welfare that shaped the post-Reagan political and economic landscape. Ryan shows the political missteps of the union and the problems of corruption while maintaining a sense that AFSCME retains the ability and potential to reform an increasingly economically and racially stratified city.

*Lebanon Valley College*

JOHN HINSHAW