Urban History Review
Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Roussopoulos, Dimitrios, ed. *The City and Radical Social Change*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1982. Pp. 352. $12.95 (paperback). $22.95 (hardcover)

Warren Magnusson

Volume 15, Number 1, June 1986

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1018916ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1018916ar

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 review

Magnusson, W. (1986). Review of [Roussopoulos, Dimitrios, ed. *The City and Radical Social Change*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1982. Pp. 352. $12.95 (paperback). $22.95 (hardcover)]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, *15*(1), 114–114. https://doi.org/10.7202/1018916ar

Updated tables and diagrams, maps, and a bibliography close the volume. This handbook remains a basic reference for the shelves of scholars of Upper Canadian history.

John H. Taylor
Department of History
Carleton University

Roussopoulos, Dimitrios, ed. *The City and Radical Social Change.* Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1982. Pp. 352. $12.95 (paperback). $22.95 (hardcover).

Nothing dates so quickly as the writing of a failed revolutionary. Half the essays in this book express the revolutionary hopes of the militants associated with the Montreal Citizens Movement in the 1970s. Most of these essays were originally published in *Our Generation,* and they reflect the squabbles and debates of the time — largely from the perspective of the "libertarian socialists." Despite the theoretical sophistication of some of the contributors — especially Stephen Schecter — their analyses seem unconvincing, because we have to read them now in light of subsequent events. Who can take seriously the hopes of these 1970s radicals when Bourassa is again Premier of Quebec, and the Parti Quebecois has abandoned its ostensible commitment to social democracy?

The most useful papers in this book have nothing to do with Montreal: a nice summation of Manuel Castells early work, by Fred Caloren; a pair of good papers by Mike Goldrick and Bill Freeman on urban reform in Toronto in the 1970s; and a couple of essays on urban development in Hamilton and Ottawa-Hull (the latter an especially meaty case-study of Campeau's Les Terasses de la Chaudiere). The Toronto articles make a nice contrast with the ones on Montreal, in both style and substance. They reveal the less ideological character of reform politics in Toronto, and they do so in a dispassionate, analytic tone, which is a welcome relief from the polemics about Montreal.

Reflecting on the experience of reform politics in Toronto and Montreal in the 1970s, one is struck by the inverse proportion between political substance and ideological sophistication. Obviously, the Toronto reformers had much more impact on their city than their Montreal counterparts. The latter were voices crying in the wilderness, whose debates (at least as reported here) became increasingly sophisticated as they got further removed from political reality. As abstract theory, some of the analyses are rather persuasive, but they rarely touch ground with the reality in Montreal. One suspects that these people would be saying exactly the same things if they were living in Miami or San Antonio. (Indeed, the "urban crisis" is often identified as a "North American" phenomenon: the specifically Canadian context is virtually ignored.) It is ironic that analyses emphasizing the importance of *local* struggles should convey so little sense of place and context, and suggest so much the imposition of abstract theories on recalcitrant facts.

There is nothing in this book that sheds much light on urban politics in the 1980s. In that respect, it is hopelessly dated. However, it may be of considerable interest to future historians who want to analyze the radical thinking about urban politics that developed in the 1970s. They may not find it as edifying as it seemed at the time.

Warren Magnusson
Department of Political Science
University of Victoria

Sharpe, L.J. and Newton, K. *Does Politics Matter? The Determinants of Public Policy.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984. Pp. XVIII, 249. £19.00.

Over the past twenty years an enormous number of studies have been produced analyzing policy outcomes and attempting to evaluate the importance of different factors in determining these outcomes. The major focus of this debate has been on whether socio-economic factors or political factors can best explain policy outcomes. The major thrust of *Does Politics Matter?* is to argue, both theoretically and on the basis of an empirical analysis of English and Welsh local government expenditures and policies, the importance of politics. The debate has the fascination and irritation of all good academic debates — delight in the imagination and intelligence focussed on very detailed questions but the occasional thought that too much attention is being given to essentially trivial points.

Does Politics Matter? has the advantage of not merely presenting statistical material with little discussion or interpretation. Sharpe and Newton do analyze considerable amounts of statistical material but they have clearly tried to keep control of their data. The book is eminently readable — and that's not true for all studies that are based on so much statistical material.

Their main contributions to the overall debate relate to two areas, defining socio-economic factors in terms of the locality as a whole and, secondly, the better definition of political factors. The two are linked, as their redefinition of the way to measure socio-economic factors relates to their understanding of the political process. The traditional method of using socio-economic variables which relate to individual characteristics of the population is flawed because, as Sharpe and Newton argue, "it assumes that government is mainly engaged in reflecting the objective socio-economic characteristics of its citizens" (p. 20). As governments also have