

Hareven, Tamara K. and Vinovskis, Maris A., editors. *Family and Population in Nineteenth-Century America*. Quantitative Studies in History Series. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978. Pp. xiv, 250

Lorne Tepperman

Volume 8, numéro 2, octobre 1979

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1019384ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1019384ar>

[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

Tepperman, L. (1979). Compte rendu de [Hareven, Tamara K. and Vinovskis, Maris A., editors. *Family and Population in Nineteenth-Century America*. Quantitative Studies in History Series. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978. Pp. xiv, 250]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 8(2), 120–123. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1019384ar>

\$600 million to \$75 billion, a figure that dwarfs even such capital intensive projects as the James Bay hydro-electric development scheme. Given sufficient incentive, Canadians and their financial institutions have the ability to finance a considerable amount of development on their own. In fact, in what should prove to be the most controversial part of the book, Lorimer hypothesizes that over-investment in real estate development has retarded much needed modernization and expansion in other areas of the Canadian economy, especially in manufacturing.

The Developers is highly recommended to the readers of this journal. Some may not like Jim Lorimer's political and economic views, but most will admit that the story of the Canadian development industry is a fascinating tale. At the very least, The Developers points to the need for more detailed studies of all aspects of Canadian urban housing development prior to 1945.

Michael J. Doucet  
Department of Geography  
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute

\* \* \*

Hareven, Tamara K. and Vinovskis, Maris A., editors. Family and Population in Nineteenth-Century America. Quantitative Studies in History Series. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978. Pp. xiv, 250.

If anyone needed proof, this book proves that historians can now crunch numbers as needlessly as sociologists and demographers. The book is made up of unrelated essays (more properly, papers) commissioned for, and discussed at, an advanced seminar on "the family in the process of urbanization" held in 1974. Time spent revising these essays may justify some of the four-year lag between presentation and publication; still, the lag is unfortunate. It is not that Nineteenth-Century America has changed in the interim; rather our conception of what social science is about may have changed.

These essays catch the tail end of a movement to quantify history that started, belatedly in America, in the 1960s (much earlier in Europe, where history and demography have long been friends) and melded into most of the rest of world history by the mid 1970s. These essays seem, therefore, not as anachronistic as the drum and bugle history some still write but, still, anachronistic. Out of charity it is possible to read these essays as though we were still living in the late 1960s and computers were darkly beautiful objects of mystery to historians. But more can be gained by asking: what do the contents of this time capsule mean to us today? And without difficulty, we can identify a few redeeming qualities in this book.

First, the editors of this volume have written an interesting introduction and literature review. Unfortunately, like the other essays in this book, it says little about research being done outside the United States, I suppose because the book is really about Nineteenth-Century America. (If it were really about families and population in the process of urbanization, as the preface indicates and the title implies, the literature reviewed would perforce have been both international and interdisciplinary. In fact, it was neither.)

Second, the book documents the "state of the art" in the early 1970s. Step right up, ladies and gentlemen: we've got numbers, we've got charts, you'll see dependency ratios and Pearson correlation coefficients, all artifacts of a functioning social science. But taken as demography, the data this volume presents are pretty limited. As an illustration, contrast these papers with those in Ronald Demos Lee's book, Population Patterns in the Past (1978), also the edited proceedings of a conference held in 1974. Not only are the hot-shots in historical demography--Ansley Coale, Nathan Keyfitz, Etienne van de Walle and Ronald Lee, to name a few--unrepresented here, they are scarcely mentioned. England's E.A. Wrigley is mentioned once or twice, France's Louis Henry not at all, and so it goes. Only Easterlin's economic demography is dealt with at any length. It seems that historians who work on demographic topics mainly read other historians who work on demographic topics, and not demographers. (Of all the essays in this volume, only Stanley Engerman's study of changes in black fertility fully escapes this accusation.)

Taken as sociological and statistical methodology, these essays are unremarkable. Though they aim to test hypotheses outside the papers by Easterlin's group and John Modell, none of the usual apparatus of hypothesis testing is in sight: not multiple regression or path analysis, analysis of variance or multiple classification analysis, spectral analysis, not even significance testing. Paradoxically there often seems to be more methodology than findings; but the dominant methodological concerns have to do with collecting, "cleaning" and tabulating difficult data. Still, hypotheses are being tested.

And this is my third point in favour of this book. Historians have begun to test hypotheses by systematically examining quantitative data. As in natural science, their ostensible goal is disproof, the discarding of wrong theories. And this book succeeds in disproving some hypotheses. For example, in several places it disproves the hypothesis that urbanization reduces fertility with any regularity. Shortly after the Second World War everyone thought that urbanization, a key process in modernization, reduced fertility. This idea was central to the so-called "demographic transition theory." However, international research that accumulated in the 1950s and 1960s demonstrated that the demographic transition theory was vastly too simple. Sometimes urbanization reduced fertility, sometimes it did not.

The European Fertility Study, supervised by Ansley Coale at

Princeton, has been very important in this area. Data on 19th century Italy, Spain, France, Germany and the rest of Europe have been collected to investigate this and related questions; but this enterprise has been ignored here. Indeed the world-wide evidence that has argued for years against the simple "urbanization reduces fertility" hypothesis has been ignored. So, just as the authors in this collected volume have struggled mightily to re-invent demography and sociological methods, they have gone to needless trouble to reject the already rejected.

Where did this conference, and this book, go wrong? The answer is plain. First, the authors did not do their homework. Working from scratch, they made all the mistakes that precocious inventors do. They have made interesting points in many places. For example, John Modell's paper on family spending is imaginative, and Laurence Glasco's inquiry into the role of kinship networks in aiding migrant adjustment is valuable. But they could have done better, particularly if they had kept within the historical tradition itself. Their other lapses could have been excused if these essays had challenged our thinking, ranged more widely or spoken more eloquently. But no, with few exceptions the writing here is, unlike most historical writing, dull "social scientese."

Many of these essays analyse data describing one moment in time, and so cannot discuss processes of change as historians generally do. This limitation of "cross-sectional analysis" is something sociologists have been trying to escape for years; for that reason alone, many sociologists have come to read history. Worst of all, the examinations of data in this book are wrenched out of their context: we are not told a story so much as we are asked to watch numbers amuse other numbers.

As a sociologist who learned demography, and only lately came to appreciate history's special charms, I feel deeply disappointed. What is the purpose of this activity? Why are family structure and such family behaviours as reproduction mistaken for things in themselves, to be measured and explained outside the socio-cultural context in which they are found. These essays scarcely discuss the interrelations of family structure with child training, social control, personality development, community organization, the class structure and distribution of wealth and power, the labour market—all of which are demonstrably affected by changes in the family and change the family in turn. These authors seem entirely untouched by the "softer" historians who write about the family using few numbers or no numbers at all. Indeed they cite one another, and their own previous work, as though the study of families had just been invented.

It is the pretense of this book that is of most concern. As scholarly papers competently describing some data, these essays easily pass muster. But this book parades as an overview and must be judged as that, and so judged, it fails. What we need is another "advanced seminar" on the family during urbanization; an interdisciplinary seminar attended by both quantitative and non-quantitative historians familiar

with European as well as North-American history. Such a seminar might review the field issue by issue, concluding that "X" is understood now but "Y" is not. Then the group might prepare an agenda for research, proposing projects that would fill the gaps in our knowledge. Not only would this approach help us to learn more quickly and avoid redundancy; it would help social science in a far more valuable way. Instead of insulating them from their fellow social scientists, such a symposium would display quantitative historians to their best advantage, as having some particular and very useful skills to offer. The rest of us, who are not quantitative historians, need to know about this. But the present book preaches to the already converted.

Lorne Tepperman  
 Department of Sociology  
 University of Toronto

\* \* \*

Cook, Edward M., Jr. The Fathers of the Towns: Leadership and Community Structure in Eighteenth-Century New England. The Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science, Ninety-fourth Series, no. 2. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976. Pp. xviii, 273. Map, tables, appendixes, notes, bibliography, and index. \$12.95.

Given the fine studies of individual New England towns which are already available, Professor Cook's Fathers of the Towns is both a logical development and a significant contribution. It is a logical scholarly step because Cook has gone beyond the anatomy of a single town to compare the patterns of leadership in seventy-four communities. It is significant because his research design, incorporating prosopographical methods and informed by central place theory, has enabled him to develop a convincing five-fold typology of towns.

This typology is defined by melding the results of a series of indices. As Cook points out, in the four colonies of New England, "the town was a territorial unit rather than a distinctly urban area." Reasoning that "property values would be highest in an urban area, and roughly proportional to the marketing of goods in rural areas" (pp. 78-79), Cook constructs a "commercialization index": a town's share of the colony's taxes divided by the area of the town. Two other indices measure the proportion of taxes paid by the wealthiest ten per cent and the proportion of prominent individuals in the town's population. Those individuals--members of famous families, college graduates, men who entered offices above the town level--reflected the "great tradition" as distinct from the "little tradition" internal to the towns. The latter was a milieu in which men progressed slowly to the office of selectmen, arriving there usually in their forties, after their "ability" had been thoroughly scrutinized by their fellow townsmen. The three