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disciplines that have studied towns, an obviously circular beginning. But it is a virtuous circle that spins off the set of problems to be considered.

The inquiry proper begins in chapter two, on London, “a plural city which encompassed almost every type of city and was supreme in each” (p. 24). Much of the story concerns the disaggregation of political authority in London, with its seven central bodies (such as the London City Council) and 94 local bodies. As Waller argues “increasingly controlling others in social and economic concerns, Londoners were incapable of controlling themselves politically, in the sense that one big authority was unrealized” (p. 66). Moreover “the root problem was that inability to marshall London opinion which was at once the attraction of London socially and its curse politically” (p. 58).

Chapter three, “Great Cities and Manufacturing Towns of the Conurbations” (using Patrick Geddes’s term for town aggregates) identifies forces toward amalgamation, federation, and cooperation in business, society, and government, as well as partisan forces of class, religion, politics, and local patriotism. According to Waller, Jane Jacob’s claim that diversification rather than specialization causes sustained growth is not true in every case. Waller makes forays into literature in relation to the ethos of a place: “Townscapes animated art and literature with fresh perspectives and, it may be, threw them into moral confusion” (p. 99). Sports was a focus of urban experience, and politics had the task of purging “two ugly features — cliquish and self-elected wire-pullers, and atomized and directionless mobs” (p. 110). The Labour Party, trade unions, female employment, and political education are discussed as overthrowing traditional distinctions and setting up new forces of social organization.

Chapter four, “New Growths,” covers the history of pleasure resorts, “more complicated than a study of property tycoons or corporations sniffing ozone and cashing in on an inevitable boom” (p. 139), and the growth of suburbs, railways, and satellite towns. The fault with planning for all these was that planners were one-dimensional: “Architects concentrated on house-building, engineers on roads, and so forth” (p. 171). Chapter five traces a continuum between urban and rural areas. A treatment of local and central government in chapter six leads to the conclusion that it is in the context of “expanding functions and straitened resources that debates about centralist versus localism should be focused, because this in many respects decided the distribution of authority” (p. 255). Waller believes the central government not only “insufficiently stimulated negligent authorities and fastidiously dampened enterprising authorities,” but also lacked “nerve” dealing with local authorities (p. 280). Chapter seven, on municipal councils and municipal services, concludes: “It seemed that half the citizenry was wanting the municipal authority to do what it could not do, and the other half was wanting it to stop what it could do” (p. 316).

Much of the force of Waller’s arguments lies in his forceful opposition to existing generalizations. He calls for a variety of types of cities and broader classifications than single-category theories, but his particularistic consciousness defeats him in any effort to propose typologies. Generalizations are hardly tenable, he says, and theoretical hypotheses, even less so: Waller aggregates phenomena primarily by a subtle play of comparison and contrast, continuities and distinctions. Such functional interrelations are doubleblind an advance over atomistic and positivistic urban theories on the one hand, or more purely theory-driven accounts on the other, but further advances in urban history will require a more complex interweaving of social-science theories with the data. This book is a comprehensive view of its subject, but its scope does not allow for depth on all points: only about six pages are devoted to crime, for example.

Waller calls this a work of “synthesis, constructed chiefly from the labours of many scholars” (p. viii), but it has few textual references, no notes, and a skimpy bibliography that does not include all scholars mentioned in the text. The creation of social coherence and community, so much a preoccupation of the book, would have been aided among urban historians by a fuller scholarly apparatus.

James Bennett
Chicago Committee for Independent Scholarship
Chicago


A feast of excellent books has appeared over the past few years on various aspects of land and housing in Victorian and Edwardian England: Cannadine, Offer, Swennarton, Muthesius, Englander. All of them should be read not just by urban historians of Britain, but by every historian of modern Britain. They have made it impossible to ignore any longer the political, economic and social centrality of their subject. Non-British urban historians cannot of course be expected to perform this task, but fortunately here is one book which incorporates much of the very latest work, taking issue with it at times, as well as making its own significant and original contribution.

Daunton argues that most approaches to the history of housing in modern Britain have been informed by the assumption of the inevitability of subsidization. What happened to happen has been presented as an almost unavoidable outcome. The result has been a teleological history which has tended to ignore the way the housing market actually functioned, and how people actually lived under what has come to be seen as a somewhat pathological system — land-
lordism. As late as 1914, 91% of housing was privately rented; only 9% was owner occupied and virtually none was state owned. By 1977 the figures were 14%, 56%, and 30% respectively. So unanimous has become the consensus in Britain that privately rented housing is exploitative and must be replaced by either subsidized (low rent) government housing or subsidized (through tax relief on mortgages) owner occupation, that left and right combined virtually to wipe out the private landlord, and thus a major sector of petit bourgeois investment, on the cold electoral calculation that this interest was politically expendable. An ironic perspective on all this is provided by Daunton’s own experience as a house buyer. Like many British middle class academics of today he aspires to be the owner-occupier of a terraced house which almost a century ago some private landlord was renting to a working class family.

Such “bye-law” houses were built in the later nineteenth century conforming with local regulations prescribing standards of space and sanitation. They varied from town to town in accordance with local taste and topography. Daunton is good in describing and accounting for their variety. He discerns in all the local responses to the “housing problem,” indeed to the whole “urban problem,” at least one common theme — the distinction between public and private space: the elimination of communal courts and the conversion of narrow streets and dead ends from semi-communal, socially ambiguous space to purely public, disciplined, anonymous space. Without taking off into the Foucaultian empyream (in fact, he never mentions him) Daunton also applies these insights to the redefinition and reallocation of interior housing space — particularly with the advent of gas for heating, lighting and cooking, and of flush toilets. One notable consequence he discusses was the cult of the front parlour or “best rooms,” that remarkable example of spatial self-denial which became the hallmark of working class respectability.

Daunton pays considerable attention to Scotland, particularly Glasgow, where the predominant form of working class urban housing was the tenement, typical of Europe, rather than the terraced house of England (except parts of north-east England). Non-English urban historians will be interested to see that he presents the English form as exceptional and draws on European and American examples in discussing the various factors which contributed to the very different English and Scottish “solutions.” The strikingly different character of Scottish land law, landlord-tenant law (much less favourable to the tenant than English law) and building codes are made admirably clear in the process. In sum, this book, handsomely produced and illustrated, is worth its startling price.

Christopher Kent
Department of History
University of Saskatchewan


Since extensive news coverage of recent Polish political developments sheds little light on Warsaw’s long history, Professor Edward Wynot’s major study of Warsaw in the 1920s and 1930s is all the more valuable. He brings considerable expertise to bear on the subject from a previous book and several articles on other aspects of inter-war Poland. The present book is well-researched and amply documented from printed primary sources (particularly government reports) contemporary analyses, and recent secondary literature. He provides the most comprehensive survey available in any language, although some significant flaws exist.

The largest city and capital of the newly-independent Polish state, Warsaw was a fascinating city of contrasts between the two world wars. Rich aristocrats rubbed elbows (or tried not to) with poor Jewish tailors. Modern engineering plants operated near artisanal shops that seemed to come out of the Middle Ages, while great department stores competed with door-to-door peddlars. In short, inter-war Warsaw had entered a transitional stage of development like Canadian cities a few decades earlier and “third world” cities a few decades later.

Warsaw comprised a population of 1,000,000 in 1921 and 1,300,000 in 1939, due to natural increase, immigration, and absorption of suburbs. It enjoyed a balanced economy and social structure with about one-third the working population involved in industry and trades, one-fifth in commerce, another fifth in public service, and the remainder split among communications, transportation, and domestic service. Industry and trade rose from 30 per cent to 40 per cent of employment during the period thanks to growth in electrical production, metallurgical industries, food processing, chemicals, and printing. On the whole, however, Warsaw industry comprised smaller and less productive enterprises than other major centres such as Upper Silesia and Lodz.

Finances posed a continual problem to the city which required national subsidies to meet a budget that ran deeper and deeper into the red, but, municipal expenditures (which were frequently mandated by the national government) reflected a surprising maturity on the part of a city government whose modern experience in self-government reached only to 1915 when Russian occupation ended. After independence, Warsaw substantially improved mass transit service, street paving, telephones, fire protection, sanitation, hospitals, other public health facilities and welfare. The city also contributed to cultural development by extending public schooling and libraries, as well as subsidizing theatres, opening a National Museum and setting up a zoo. With all this activity, Warsaw easily assumed a central position in