Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Warner, Sam Bass Jr., and Fleisch, Sylvia. *Measurements for Social History*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977. Pp. 232. Illustrations. \$6.95 paper, \$15.00 cloth

Jim Simmons

Numéro 3-78, february 1979

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1019415ar DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/1019415ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (imprimé) 1918-5138 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer ce compte rendu

érudit

Simmons, J. (1979). Compte rendu de [Warner, Sam Bass Jr., and Fleisch, Sylvia. *Measurements for Social History*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977. Pp. 232. Illustrations. \$6.95 paper, \$15.00 cloth]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, (3-78), 134–137. https://doi.org/10.7202/1019415ar

All Rights Reserved © Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine, 1979

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

https://www.erudit.org/fr/

thinking" and a "belief in the possibility for social advance." Buck does acknowledge that the divided left failed to become the major representative of this sentiment, and that virtually all workers were uninterested in thinking or organizing on a class basis. However, a small group of radical socialists was ready for a sharp left turn. Disillusioned with moderate independent labour politics and the United Farmers of Ontario government, excited by events in Europe, and rejecting the existing Canadian socialist parties as inadequate, they formed the Communist Party of Canada in 1921.

Unfortunately, the account's usefulness collapses whenever it discusses Canadian socialist parties before the formation of the Communist group. The chapter on labour in Toronto politics is a highly inaccurate jumble of parties, personalities and policies. The Socialist Party of Canada is confused with the Socialist Party of North America, as is the Social Democratic Federation with the Social Democratic Party of Canada; James Simpson was not a member of the ILP and was elected to the Board of Control in 1914, not in 1913. The assertion that Simpson "insisted that there must be no organization" of labour political campaigns is false. Many similar examples could be cited. The editors should have been more attentive to these errors, while noting other mistakes such as Buck's confusing of the Taff Vale case with the Osborne Judgement, and his reference to H. H. Stevens' 1935 "People's Party." Buck's autobiography is not very explicit about the causes of his transition to "scientific socialism." But it does remind the historian of the key importance for Canadian labour and radical development of a significant body of British-born skilled workingmen who were imbued with Christian idealism and affected by technological and managerial innovations at the level of the shop floor.

> Gene Howard Hamel Toronto

* * * * * * * * * * *

Warner, Sam Bass Jr., and Fleisch, Sylvia. <u>Measurements for Social History</u>. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977. Pp. 232. Illustrations. \$6.95 paper, \$15.00 cloth.

First, to keep the record straight, this book is simply word for word the same material that appeared in the <u>Journal of Urban History</u>, III, under the title "The Past of Today's Present: A Social History of America's Metropolises, 1860-1960." Only sixty-five pages are text: the remainder of the book is filled with data appendices in very large print. The appendices have been very modestly enlarged from the original article by the addition of a list which identifies the components of each areal unit of observation. The research deserves widespread circulation, however, for it is truly a pioneering effort. Warner and Fleisch break new ground in at least three areas. They focus on the development of the system of American cities, a neglected topic in the rush to analyse social change within particular cities; they adopt as their unit of analysis the Bureau of Economic Analysis system of urban-centred regions, avoiding the tedious rural-urban controversies that have absorbed too much effort too long; and they introduce some of the techniques of multivariate statistical analysis as a means of generalizing from large amounts of information. Their efforts have been remarkably productive, not only for the numerous substantive results, but in terms of the methodological questions that their innovations raise, and the new points of departure that now lie open.

The analysis begins with the 171 BEA areal units as defined in Each unit is a set of counties, centred on a metropolitan area. 1960. The units are large, extensive areas, which in aggregate cover the continental United States. New England, for instance, is allocated to five places: Bangor, Portland, Burlington, Boston and Hartford. Each spatial unit remains constant over time, and for each census back until 1860, six variables are defined: population, and the percentage who are male, foreign-born, black, adult; and the value added in manufacturing per capita (the authors are forced to drop some of the western BEA's from the earlier cross-sections because the data are unavailable, and the manufacturing measure is missing in 1910). The six variables are input to a hierarchical grouping algorithm in order to obtain a five-group taxonomy of BEA's for each census, and these groups are modified and finally described by means of an iterative discriminant analysis. This taxonomy is discussed in some detail; and in the final section it is compared with the pattern of decadal population growth.

The methodological innovations of this study are compelling, but the authors spend very little time in discussing the pros and cons and implications. The concept of the BEA is based on the relative functional roles of cities in 1960, operating within the transportation and communications systems of that year. It is worth discussing the relevance of the regionalization one hundred years earlier. The value of the BEA concept for historical studies is essentially operational: the boundaries do not change, and the service functions of the city are aggregated with the rural economy on which it depends. Still, one can debate, and test, whether a system of twice as many nodes, or using different assignment criteria, or imposing some kind of hierarchical structure, might have given different results. The multivariate analysis is quite preliminary, not really comparable with examples such as Berry, Russett or Goheen.* Classifications represent a very elementary kind of science, particularly when there isn't any particular objective to guide the analysis. Why these variables? Why five groups? Many other possible analyses seem to have been forgone - particularly those which deal with the dynamic relationships. Why not group cities over time as well as in cross-section? Why not explicitly examine inter-census social change? Why not try to link social changes of all kinds to structural characteristics? The analyses presented, and the form of presentation (i.e. the tables and maps provided) are so selective that this reader felt unnecessarily insulated from the data. I like to roll around in mounds of correlation coefficients, so that I can test my own ideas.

Nonetheless the substantive results are provocative. Like many initial explorations of large data sets, this one tends to destroy most of the carefully constructed theories of growth and change constructed from fragmentary data samples. We find that American cities are growing more alike, in virtually all categories, over time, but that the relationships among the study variables can reverse and reverse again over time (for instance the correlations between per cent male and manufacturing, foreign-born and blacks). The variance in population growth remains constant but there is an increasing polarization of growth into a smaller and smaller number of centres. The measures which best differentiate American cities centre on demographic variables, particularly males, and adults, rather than the frequently hypothesized population size, growth and economic base.

Dominating all the findings are the complexity of the processes of social change. Working at a national scale introduces the full diversity of American urbanization, weighting the Southern and Western urban experiences as much as the Northeast. We learn that there are innumerable paths to the present condition. Even the regional groupings of cities break down, and recombine every few decades. There are no clearly identifiable stages of growth or cycles of development apparent. Rapid population growth cuts right across the typology of population composition. In the fall-out from the analysis hundreds of minor hypotheses about social change emerge in the text, to be pursued in some other form of analysis. We become aware of the many kinds of changes that could have occurred but never did.

*Berry, Brian J. L. <u>Essays on Commodity Flows and the Spatial Structure</u> of the Indian Economy. Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Geography, 1966. Research Paper III.

Russett, Bruce M. International Regions and the International System. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Goheen, Peter G. <u>Victorian Toronto, 1850 to 1900</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Geography, 1970. Research Paper No. 127.

In sum, Warner and Fleisch have demonstrated that for the urban system -- just in studies of particular cities -- the use of different data and different techniques destroys many of our earlier preconceptions and raises fundamentally different issues in their place. Questions concerning growth and city size, and the nature of frontiers are quickly dispensed with, and debates about family structure, acculturation and industrialization -- all the processes of social change -- have only just begun. One senses that Warner feels a bit uncomfortable in the midst of such an exciting chaos. He begins bravely with some highly quotable phrases in the introductory section, but in the conclusion he retreats into a pitch for the BEA units. He neglects the fundamental advantage of multivariate analysis: it provides several different answers all at once.

> Jim Simmons Department of Geography University of Toronto

* * * * * * * * * * *

Macfarlane, Alan, in collaboration with Sarah Harrison and Charles Jardine. <u>Reconstructing Historical Communities</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. Pp. xii, 222. Illustrations. 21 figures. \$8.77.

Appropriately produced as something less than a fully developed monograph, this book is in fact an elaborate report on a mammoth research project in progress. In brief, Macfarlane's study proposes to gather all documented aspects of the lives of two small English communities from a range of disparate sources, and to link these through an elaborate indexing system in order to reconstruct to the fullest extent possible the life of both communities between the sixteenth century and the eighteenth. The book's major divisions are determined by the need to set the project into context; although lengthy, the more general sections are neither sufficiently systematic nor detailed enough to carry much independent value.

A critical introduction to community studies, and to network analysis, is followed by chapters discussing the nature of Macfarlane's sources, and his methods of collecting and indexing the material. These key chapters are mostly devoted to describing the twelve classes of records, manorial, juridical, and ecclesiastical, on which the project is based, and to a summary of experience gathered in their transcription and breakdown in a series of interrelated indices. The purpose, here as elsewhere, is not only to describe, but to encourage other researchers to pursue studies along similar lines, to argue their feasibility, and to describe methods which have proved workable in the experience of Macfarlane's team. The final chapters give a frankly impressionistic first attempt to evaluate results which are beginning to emerge, and to assess candidly the limitations of community studies in general.