

Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Notes and Comments

Indexing and abstracting services; Contributors; Cover photograph; Notes; Comments

Notes et commentaires

Indexation et services d'indexation; Collaborateurs; Photo de la page couverture; Notes; Commentaires

Volume 10, Number 2, October 1981

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1019097ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1019097ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (print)

1918-5138 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this document

(1981). Notes and Comments: Indexing and abstracting services; Contributors; Cover photograph; Notes; Comments / Notes et commentaires : indexation et services d'indexation; Collaborateurs; Photo de la page couverture; Notes; Commentaires. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 10(2), 35–40. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1019097ar>

Notes and Comments/Notes et commentaires

Articles appearing in this journal are indexed and/or abstracted in *Urban Canada/Canada Urbain*; *Canadian Periodical Index*; *Arts and Humanities Citation Index*; *Geo Abstracts*; *Historical Abstracts*; *America: History and Life*; and *Current Contents*.

Contributors/Collaborateurs

Darrell A. Norris is a research associate in geography at McMaster University and is engaged in full-time research for the Historical Atlas of Canada. Dr. Darrell A. Norris, Department of Geography, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4K1.

Derek Hum is associate professor of economics and a Fellow of St. John's College, University of Manitoba. His special interests include economic theory, quantitative methods, evaluation research, and urban studies. He has published a wide variety of articles and monographs in economics, mathematics, sociology, anthropology, statistical demography, and numerous aspects of public policy, particularly social security issues. At present he is completing a book on labour supply estimation and a study of Canada's welfare system. Professor Derek Hum, Department of Economics, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 2M6.

Paul Phillips, professor of economics, University of Manitoba, is the author of several books including *No Power Greater: A Century of Labour in British Columbia* and *Regional Disparities*. He has also edited and written the introduction for the long-awaited publication of the late H.C. Pentland's landmark study, *Labour and Capital in Canada, 1650-1860*, recently released by James Lorimer and Co. He is currently completing an edited collection of the published and unpublished work of the foremost interpreter of the western Canadian agricultural economy, V.C. Fowke. Professor Paul Phillips, Department of Economics, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 2M6.

Gene Howard Homel is currently teaching in the Department of History at Simon Fraser University. He has also taught at York University and the University of Toronto. Professor Gene H. Homel, Department of History, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, V5A 1S6.

Cover Photograph/Photo de la page couverture

Revere Hotel, Markdale, Grey County, Ontario, taken from "Grey Supplement" of the *Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada* (Toronto: H. Belden and Co., 1880).

Notes

L'Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture et les études urbaines

En juin 1979, l'Assemblée nationale du Québec adoptait un projet de loi créant l'Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture (Lois du Québec, 1979, chap. 10). Dès les premiers mois de 1980, les membres du conseil d'administration du nouvel institut adoptaient de grandes orientations, de même qu'ils choisissaient les premiers thèmes de recherche. Peu de temps après, des chercheurs étaient engagés, tant et si bien que le premier rapport annuel de l'IQRC, déposé à l'Assemblée nationale en juin

1980, pouvait déjà esquisser un profil des recherches en cours et des résultats escomptés.

Il importe de préciser au départ que le statut juridique de l'IQRC est passablement original dans le milieu des sciences humaines au Québec. L'Institut est, en effet, un organisme public non-gouvernemental. C'est donc dire qu'il relève non pas d'un ministère mais directement de l'Assemblée nationale. L'État nomme les membres du conseil d'administration et verse à l'Institut une subvention annuelle à même le fonds consolidé du Québec. Cette subvention indexable était de l'ordre de \$1.2 millions,

pour l'exercice financier 1981-82. L'Institut peut, par ailleurs, solliciter des fonds de d'autres sources publiques ou privées, comme c'est le cas pour les universités.

Par ailleurs, l'Institut, via son conseil d'administration et son comité scientifique, est libre de déterminer les orientations de recherche qu'il juge bon et d'associer à ses projets, des chercheurs du milieu universitaire ou d'ailleurs. C'est ainsi que plusieurs universitaires ont été nommés chercheurs associés et dirigent des projets financés par l'Institut. D'autres chercheurs sont à l'emploi direct de l'Institut, à plein temps ou à temps partiel. Cependant, l'IQRC n'est pas un organisme subventionnaire; il ne finance que des projets qui s'intègrent dans son programme général de recherche.

En juin 1981, l'Institut rendait public son deuxième rapport annuel. On y dénombre quelque trente (30) projets de recherche d'importance variable qui se regroupent en fonction de trois grands thèmes: 1- l'identité et les changements culturels, 2- la culture populaire, 3- la culture savante. A cela s'ajoute une contribution au développement des infrastructures de recherche (bibliographies, statistiques culturelles, etc.) et une volonté de dialogue avec les milieux culturels (régions, milieux artistiques, etc.).

Dès le départ, l'Institut a voulu éviter de dédoubler la recherche déjà existante dans les universités et a choisi d'orienter ses ressources en fonction de nouveaux champs de recherche. L'accent a été mis sur différents phénomènes liés à la culture urbaine et industrielle, sans pour autant exclure d'autres approches. Dans son organisation et son recrutement, l'Institut est interdisciplinaire: historiens, sociologues, ethnologues, économistes, etc. s'y côtoient et travaillent sur des problèmes communs ou voisins.

Parmi les projets de l'Institut plus directement liés aux études urbaines, quelques-uns méritent d'être soulignés au passage....

Ainsi, une enquête sociologique sur la condition féminine en milieu populaire est en cours, sous la direction d'Alain Vinet. L'analyse des données a débuté et elle se poursuivra au cours de l'automne 1981. Parallèlement, Fernand Harvey est responsable d'un projet portant sur l'ethnologie du savoir ouvrier. Il s'agit, en somme, de mieux connaître, par des entrevues, comment les travailleurs de deux usines de Québec se représentent leur travail. Ce champ de recherche est relativement nouveau, car si l'on connaît plusieurs aspects de la culture ouvrière en relation avec le milieu de vie, on en sait beaucoup moins sur le milieu de travail à proprement parler. Que signifie le passage de l'artisanat à la mécanisation et à l'automation pour le savoir ouvrier? Voilà l'interrogation centrale de cette recherche dont le premier volet devrait être terminé au printemps de 1982. Par ailleurs, dans le cadre de ce

même projet, des recherches ont été réalisées par Nicole Thivierge et Jean-Pierre Cherland sur l'évolution de l'enseignement professionnel au Québec, de 1850 à 1980; ces résultats seront publiés au début de 1982.

Les relations sociales et la vie communautaire en milieu populaire retiennent aussi l'attention de l'Institut qui a chargé les sociologues Marcel Rioux et Gabriel Gagnon de diriger une équipe de recherche sur le sujet. Il s'agit de savoir dans quelle mesure la culture populaire s'alimente à des communautés de vie et dans quelle mesure elle est susceptible d'y trouver ses facultés d'auto-détermination.

La ville, à proprement parler, fait l'objet de certains projets de recherche. Ainsi, l'architecte Jean-Claude Marsan travaille à un ouvrage-synthèse sur la culture dans l'aménagement futur de Montréal. Mais le passé n'est pas oublié pour autant: Yvan Lamonde poursuit des recherches sur l'histoire de la culture populaire urbaine au Québec. Il compte notamment rédiger, en collaboration avec Raymond Montpetit, une histoire du Parc Sohmer de Montréal (1889-1919), véritable microcosme du divertissement urbain au tournant du siècle.

S'il est une question reliée à la problématique urbaine, c'est bien celle de l'immigration et des groupes ethniques. Ce champ de recherche n'a jamais été exploré de façon systématique au Québec. L'Institut consacre d'importantes ressources humaines à ce projet dirigé par Gary Caldwell et Fernand Harvey, en collaboration avec Pierre Anctil et une équipe d'assistants. C'est dans la perspective des communautés culturelles que s'oriente ce projet en tenant compte, en même temps, de l'évolution des rapports entre ces communautés et la majorité canadienne-française du Québec.

A court terme, quelques publications préliminaires sont prévues vers la fin de 1981 dans le cadre de ce projet: une bibliographie annotée sur les Juifs du Québec (plus de 1,600 titres), une monographie-synthèse sur la communauté juive du Québec et une autre sur la communauté grecque. On consacrera également le deuxième numéro de la nouvelle revue de l'IQRC, *Questions de culture* (publiée par les éditions Leméac), aux migrations et aux communautés culturelles au Québec.

D'une façon générale, la politique des publications de l'Institut comportera trois volets principaux: 1- des ouvrages publiés en co-édition avec un éditeur québécois, 2- une revue thématique bi-annuelle, 3- des cahiers (bibliographies, rapports de recherche, statistiques, etc.), publiés par l'IQRC.

Les historiens et les sociologues seront heureux d'apprendre que l'Institut publiera, en octobre 1981, un *Répertoire bibliographique d'histoire du Canada et du Québec*. Le premier tome, issu de la banque ordinolingue HISCAB-

EQ, contiendra quelque 23,000 titres et couvrira de façon la plus systématique possible tout ce qui a été publié au Canada et à l'étranger, entre 1966 et 1975, concernant l'histoire du Canada et de ses différentes provinces. D'autres tomes sont en préparation pour les périodes 1945-1965 et 1976-1980.

L'Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture est présidé par monsieur Fernand Dumont; monsieur Jean Gagné en assume la direction générale. On peut se procurer le deuxième rapport annuel de l'IQRC en écrivant à son siège social [47, rue Ste-Ursule, Québec, P.Q. G1R 4E4. tél. (418) 643-4695].

Fernand Harvey
chercheur de l'Institut

Winnipeg Historical Buildings

The City of Winnipeg Historical Buildings Committee has published *Monuments to Finance: Three Winnipeg Banks* by David Spector. It contains detailed researched on three of Winnipeg's most important banking structures as well as an overview of other finance houses at the turn of the century. Copies can be purchased at \$7.50 by writing Planning Library, City of Winnipeg, 2nd Floor, 100 Main Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3C 1A5.

Metropolis, 1890-1940:

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE PLANNING HISTORY GROUP*

The second international conference of the Planning History Group was held at the University of Sussex in August 1980, and took as its theme what was arguably the ultimate challenge for modern planning – the metropolis. Concentrating on the period 1890-1940, when the history of world urbanization was dominated by the great urban areas, the conference, organized by Dr. A. SUTCLIFFE (University of Sheffield), sought to examine on an internationally comparative basis the nature and dynamic of the metropolis, and at the same time investigate the roots of urban and regional planning as it is known today. The colloquium concentrated on the four largest urban agglomerations in inter-war Europe – London, Paris, Berlin, and the Ruhr – along with New York and Tokyo. De-

tailed papers on each of these centres were discussed in the context of thematic papers on aspects of the metropolitan phenomenon.

The problem posed by the metropolis for both intellectuals and planners were tackled at the outset. Dr. A. LEES (Rutgers University) argued that in the literature of urban analysis and description that was produced in steadily growing abundance during the nineteenth century – first in Britain and then in France and Germany – there was more and more emphasis on big cities and the identification within that sector of the “modern big city of international importance,” preferably with a population in excess of one million – the *Welstadt*. Problems which could be discovered in most large cities, in contrast to small towns and villages, became more and more evident as one moved up the population. What was apparent from this survey of the analyses and descriptions of the metropolis between 1890 and 1940 was the pervasiveness of many themes that appeared in the writings of the authors examined. Men saw their cities as enormously dynamic economic and cultural power bases, whether for good or evil. Most thinkers were struck by the freedom the metropolis permitted, although this freedom was often regarded negatively as a symptom of social disorganization and a cause of loneliness. As time went on, there was growing emphasis on the ways in which the metropolis could reduce men's autonomy by forcing them to conform to the standards of a mass society, but by and large freedom remained the keynote. The world cities were, after all, places of freedom and stimuli to thought, both because of their inner variety and because of their cultural institutions. For these reasons, among others, it was argued that they were bound to exert a powerful attraction on men of ideas. Examining the challenges and responses to the metropolis, Professor P. HALL (University of Reading) put forward what he saw as two stages of perception distinguishing such problems: the first stemming from the raw facts of poverty in the congested metropolis of the first industrial revolution; the second coming along when the problems of the first stage began to be overcome in the 1920s and 1930s and taking the form of a reaction against the physical spread of the metropolis. As a consequence, by 1940 the great metropolitan cities were still at very different stages of evolution. Reactions to these facts had taken different forms, with different intensity of feeling. In particular, the Garden City movement had scored modest triumphs in Britain, in France, and in Germany. The movement had promised a revolution in the United States but had then broken against the resistance of market forces and had been ousted in the Soviet Union. Equally varied, it was argued, were the attitudes of different nations to the future of their giant metropolitan regions, which still depended fundamentally on political philosophy as to the desirable and practicable limits of planning. In responding to these papers, members of the conference drew attention to the considerable variation, particularly in cultural and political terms, exhibited in the different cities ex-

* For a report on the first conference, see *Urban History Review*, No. 1-78 (June 1978), pp. 48-56. For more information on the second conference, including the plans for publication of the papers, write Dr. A. Sutcliffe, Department of Economic and Social History, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England, S10 2TN.

amined and questioned the basis on which such cities could be separated and identified as metropolitan. It was perhaps the distinctions between such cities and other forms of urban life that marked off the metropolis in a world sense.

By way of illustration of this theme, the conference then heard papers from Dr. J. SHEPHERD (University of London) and Dr. N. EVENSON (University of California) on London and Paris respectively, which allowed for comparison of alternative approaches to metropolitan planning for redevelopment of the worn out environment of the inner urban area, the decentralization of population and economic activity, and the containment of further outward growth of the built-up area. In Paris, the picture painted was of a centralized city which had remained remarkably stable in its physical form, with the most rapid changes occurring in the burgeoning residential suburbs following World War I. To advocates of dynamic planning action, the period between 1890 and 1940 was characterized by stagnation and impotence. Arguably, "between Haussmann and the most recent works of urbanism... there is nothing." In London, on the other hand, the planning symbol of the post Second World War period, the Greater London Plan of 1944, derived its legitimacy not only from its respect of historical functions and associations and the sense of community of London as a whole and in its parts, but also from the fact that it drew upon a long gestation time, roughly covering the period 1890 to 1940, in which its major elements were discussed, propagandized and even tested. In this sense, planning in London reflected the evolution of an acceptable and essentially implementable strategy for restructuring and guiding metropolitan growth. This historical contrast of alternative metropolitan strategies was challenged in the course of discussion when members drew attention to the similarities of approach apparent in transport policies and suburban aspirations. In reality the freedom of choice available to town planners was constrained and controlled.

This historical re-assessment was followed by essentially geographical case studies, when Dr. A. FRENCH (University of London), Professor K. JACKSON (Columbia University) and Professor H. MATZERATH (Free University of Berlin) analyzed in turn the growth and development of Moscow, New York and Berlin. Reflecting on the extent to which these cities exhibited the characteristic features of a metropolis, this comparative exercise forced forward the fundamental question of which of these characteristics were the manifestation of a generally observable pattern of urban development, which were the result of the societal conditions arising from the political and economic structures in different countries, and which were the product of specific conditions affecting a particular town. Of the world's largest metropolitan areas, Moscow alone has grown under the guidance of a fully planned economy for over half a century. The level of state control

has given its own special characteristics to the city. Moscow would in any case have become significant as a metropolis, but its particular world consequence and its form and appearance owe most to the socio-political system deriving from the 1917 Revolution. A distinctive dependence on national determinants was likewise argued in the case of Berlin which was always more the exception than the rule among German cities. The state had always had at its disposal special ways of influencing the course of events in the capital, and there had been special arrangements for the administration of the city. Berlin registered general developments earlier and in an extreme form. This led to the conclusion that metropolises could be better compared with other metropolises than with the cities of the same urban system. The arguments underlying such a standard of comparison were strengthened in the portrayal of New York as the ultimate city – "unique in the nation as a real city." But then, as speakers stressed, all cities are unique phenomena however hard geographers or historians endeavour arbitrarily to identify crucial periods and common patterns.

In the final session devoted to particular metropolitan regions, Dr. J. REULECKE (University of Bochum) and Dr. S. WATANABE (Building Research Institute, Tokyo), in papers on the Ruhr and Tokyo, analyzed those phenomena in the metropolis which were the product of industrial society and those which were the results of conscious planning. Modern urban planning had been institutionalized with a strongly built-in anti-metropolitan bias. This planning system was most strongly supported by the then emerging middle-class, who with increasing political power wanted to move out into suburbia, which had previously been open only to the more affluent classes. It remains an interesting irony that modern urban planning is so deeply biased by anti-urban ideology. A sharp contrast was presented by Japanese planning to which the anti-urban or anti-metropolitan bias was virtually alien. Pioneering Japanese planners, with a strong urban tradition and centralized planning powers, tried to foster the metropolis rather than to discourage it, like Britons, or to dismantle it, like Americans. Japan, it was argued, was one of the rare cases in which the metropolis was still doing well at the functional as well as the ideological level. If Tokyo provided a contrast in attitudes of planning toward the metropolis, then the Ruhr area challenged the very concept of metropolis, which arguably depended for its vitality and its capacity for radiating influence on centripetal forces. The Ruhr in its shape and nature had been determined by industry; it had no central core and no central administration; it was not a cultural centre. For reasons detailed in the paper, the centrifugal elements in the Ruhr area gained a final victory over the centripetal influences despite all attempts to reinforce the latter, in a planning and administrative sense, between 1920 and 1933. The development of this agglomeration without a single core presented a good example of the possibility that even polycentric conurbations can demonstrate certain metropolitan

tan characteristics without merging into a single metropolis. In determining the essential characteristics and concept of a metropolis, the example of both these cities drew the attention of the conference, as the subsequent discussion demonstrated, to the significance of national and multi-national factors. The role as a world city could not be divorced from those factors, historical and socio-economic, which determined the development of any particular metropolitan phenomenon.

Apparent from all these case studies was the remarkable consistency, both over time and between nations, with which the great metropolises in this period came to be seen as a major problem requiring action at the highest national level. The impact of those phenomena and those problems for art, architecture, literature, and the cinema were investigated in a series of papers by Professor T. SHAPIRO (University of California), Professor L.O. LARSSON (University of Stockholm), Dr. P. KEATING (University of Edinburgh), and Dr. A. SUTCLIFFE (University of Sheffield). Modern art, particularly literature and painting, abounds with images and scenes from city life, but that in itself is not peculiar to the twentieth century. Earlier novelists, for example, had already evoked the complexity and variety of European cities, and had struggled to capture a sense of the totality of urban experience. The phenomenon of the metropolis, or of the "coming cities" as defined by Wells, did pose a special challenge at the turn of the century. The metropolis came to be regarded as symptomatic of a deeply-rooted cultural crisis. As it developed during the last decade of the nineteenth century, the metropolis was regarded by most critics as something negative: an unhealthy, disordered and over-crowded place; an ambiance creating social misery, alienation, and political unrest. The metropolis was a picture of chaos. The cinema, for example, echoed literature and graphic art in portraying the metropolis as an undesirable force – an environment in which poor, decent people were degraded and the rich, meanwhile, were tempted into excess by metropolitan opportunities. A majority of critics therefore rejected the metropolis, at least as a place in which to live; those who did not reject the big city altogether sought to replace the chaotic metropolis by a well-organized one. The reaction against the metropolis after 1945 was deeply rooted in its artistic portrayal.

Thereafter the giant city no longer carried all before it, and the industrial world began to evolve towards a looser settlement structure based on extensive networks of smaller towns. Yet many of the planning policies and popular attitudes generated in the struggle with the metropolis survived to dominate urban strategies in the present-day world. Thus in drawing these strands together the conference closed with the reflections of Professor B. BERRY (Harvard University) and Dr. D. EVERSLEY (Policy Studies Institute, London) on the survival of the metropolis. In the period 1890 to 1940 the metropolis had seemed to pose insoluble problems. Planning thus became locked in

a struggle with the metropolis, as the earlier case studies and thematic papers had indicated; it was a struggle which left its mark on urban and regional planning thereafter. While metropolitan planning had become increasingly differentiated along socio-economic lines after the Second World War, this resulted in much of that planning actually failing to meet the needs of a particular locality within a national situation. Today the trends and cross-currents of metropolitan planning have, it was claimed, become even more confused, with a three-way conflict between efficiency, social justice, and environmental interests. 1940 marked a turning point; the question now is not one of revival but of survival. Arguably, "nobody can produce a scenario in which the metropolis can keep its function and its peace."

The conference thus brought to the fore the significance of the metropolis in posing the ultimate challenge for planning. With its investigation of this relatively neglected period of the development of environmental planning, the conference had generated greater understanding of the roots of urban and regional planning and its structure and significance today. Taking up the challenge thrown down at the conclusion of the Group's First International Conference in 1977, this conference questioned the self-imposed confines of planning history, and involved that history in the ideologies and realities of town planning and in the examination of planning function and theory.

Martin Gaskell
Council for National Academic Awards

Recent Publications

Centre for Urban and Community Studies
University of Toronto
150 St. George Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1A1

MAJOR REPORT SERIES

Katherine Willson, *Housing Improvement Policy in England and Wales: A History and Comparative Review* (February 1981), 75pp., \$3.50. Report No. 18.

John Hitchcock, *Neighbourhood Form and Convenience: A City-Suburban Comparison* (April 1981), 62pp., \$3.00. Report No. 19.

RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

J.David Hulchanski, *The Origins of Land Use Planning in Alberta, 1900-1945* (January 1981), 63pp., \$3.00. Paper No. 119.

J.W. Simmons and P.T. Flanagan, *The Movement of Growth Impulses Through the Canadian Urban System* (January 1981), 60pp., \$3.00. Paper No. 120.

R. Breton, W.W. Isajiw, W. Kalbach, J.G. Reitz, *Ethnic Pluralism in an Urban Setting: Conceptual and Technical Overview of a Research Project* (May 1981), 30pp., \$2.00. Paper No. 121.

R. Breton, *The Ethnic Community as a Resource in Relation to Group Problems: Perceptions and Attitudes* (May 1981), 66pp., \$3.00. Paper No. 122.

J.G. Reitz, L. Calzavara, D. Dasko, *Ethnic Inequality and Segregation in Jobs* (May 1981), 78pp., \$3.50. Paper No. 123.

CHILD IN THE CITY SERIES

E. Koulack and V. Young, *The Student Employment Experience Centre: An Evaluation of a Work Experience Project for Out of School Young Adolescents* (March 1981), 55pp., \$3.00. Report No. 10.

M. Friendly and L.C. Johnson, *Perspectives on Work-Related Day Care* (May 1981), 28pp., \$2.00. Report No. 11.

Prairie Architecture

A Special Issue of *PRAIRIE FORUM*

edited by
Trevor Boddy

In the past, little emphasis has been placed on architecture in the prairies, either by those living there or by students of architecture. This volume is an attempt to rectify the situation.

In this special issue of *Prairie Forum*, guest editor Trevor Boddy has collected six fascinating and varied studies of buildings in the prairie provinces. From log cabins to legislative buildings the architectural marks made by and for western settlers are explored, as are attempts to prevent the destruction of this heritage resource.

This special issue may be obtained by writing *Prairie Forum*, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan, S4S 0A2 and enclosing a cheque or money order for \$7.50 made payable to the University of Regina.

Prairie Forum Vol. 5, No. 2 (Architecture Issue)

Contents

Notes for a History of Prairie Architecture *Trevor Boddy*

The Three Prairie Legislative Buildings *Diana Bodnar*

Building the University of Saskatchewan *Don Kerr*
Log Buildings of West Central Alberta *William Wonders and Mark Rasmussen*

The Log Buildings of Ukrainian Settlers of Western Canada *John Lehr*

The Historic Winnipeg Restoration Area *Steve Barber and Charles Brook*

Towards a Prairie Architecture *Etienne Gaboury*

Prairie Forum, Journal of the Canadian Plains Research Center, is a refereed multidisciplinary journal serving as an outlet for research relating to the Canadian prairie region. In addition to the regular issues containing papers on a variety of topics, special theme issues will occasionally be published. *Prairie Architecture* is the first of these theme issues.