

Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

A Preface

John H. Taylor

Numéro 1, february 1972

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1020636ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1020636ar>

[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 document

Taylor, J. H. (1972). A Preface. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, (1), 1-1. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1020636ar>

A PREFACE

First discussions regarding this review occurred in late 1970 and involved people from a number of disciplines, universities, institutions and regions. There was consensus on purpose, but we determined in addition to canvass as broad a section of 'urbanologists' as we knew to obtain their advice and good opinion. We also sought contributors. We doubtless overlooked some, but that is more a reflection on our ignorance than on their eminence. To them we offer apology and solicit future support and contributions. Among those canvassed the reaction was generally favorable. Indeed, there seemed to be need for some sort of little review and sufficient support to warrant its publication.

The variety of response was also encouraging, and in keeping with our original intentions of involving people with a variety of interests in urban development, both amateur and professional. Our only stricture was, as now, that the interest in the Canadian city be in the retrospective sense. That is, we are interested in urban historians with a small 'h' whether they be social scientists, archivists, planners or even capital 'H' Historians.

We also hoped the review would be something more than a newsletter, but something less than a learned

journal. We wished to avoid just lists of current events, theses in progress, book reviews, or course reviews. Certainly, we wanted to be current, but we wanted evaluation as well as information. For example, the multiple book review, centred on a man's work or some theme, would be preferred, and articles on research in progress, while falling short of a polished monograph, would, we hoped, at least contain the essence of a potential monograph or a potential thesis. We wanted to pass on information from a variety of people studying the development of urban Canada: what they are doing, what they think needs to be done, how it can best be done, and what sort of materials are there to do it. Speculation would be as welcome as anticipation.

Our endeavours have been in a sense justified by finding a willing publisher in the National Museum of Man. They are, from our point of view, ideal. Not only is the museum interested in the urban development of Canada, but that interest comprehends a number of disciplines, professional institutions and local interests. We trust this review will be of sufficient value to repay their consideration and commitment.

John H. Taylor,
For the Editorial
Board.