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J.W.R. Whitehand has collected four papers by M.R.G. Conzen and contributed introductory and concluding essays of his own, assessing the background to and influence of Conzen's work. The four works, published between 1962 and 1978 and including one that has been translated from German, do not include Conzen's best known study, of Alnwick, Northumberland, the influence of which suffuses this book. This masterpiece, perhaps the most effective demonstration of Conzen's methodology and its value, validates the subsequent publications presented here and is a touchstone for those who would seek to learn from this research tradition.

Urban morphogenesis, in the coded brevities of social science, describes Conzen's approach to the historical investigation of change in the landscape of towns. Whitehand, in tracing the morphological approach adopted by Conzen to the German context of his scholarly origins, also helps us to understand the remarkable isolation of this man's work from contemporary currents in urban geography in the English speaking world. Signs of increased interest in the historical evolution of town plans, and in such of the components of this analysis as the minute examination of changes in the intensity and use of individual land parcels, are carefully outlined in Whitehand's concluding chapter. Whitehand recognizes some apparent barriers to the adoption of such an approach to the study of cities in America where until recently neither geographers nor other social scientists interested in towns considered their historical development to be worth the serious study that attends issues of practical or theoretical significance. There are, however, now signals of a change of mind, not least in the interest governments are taking in studying and preserving, or even recreating where it be deemed necessary, crucial historical elements of townscapes.

In this context, on this side of the Atlantic, there is immediate value in being reminded of Conzen's research and in having conveniently to hand some of his critical and interpretive writings. Many of us will benefit from closely examining these thoughtful essays that should convince us, if of nothing else, that there is a need to study the whole and to see the most interesting parts in the context in which they were set.
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The Grand Domestic Revolution — a term coined in 1855 by anarchist Stephen Pearl Andrews — was to socialize housework by moving cooking, laundry and child care out of the home into communal settings and thus not only revolutionize the life style of Americans but also the architecture and design of their living-space. Dolores Hayden's painstakingly researched work presents the protagonists of that revolution, those "material feminists" who, since the middle of last century, have linked women's emancipation to their freedom from domestic work. What Hayden offers is no less than a reinterpretation of nineteenth and early twentieth century feminism, basing it on the feminists' struggle "to overcome the split between domestic life and public life" and accepting both spheres. This projection of the private sphere into the public arena permeated the various campaigns for the vote, temperance, higher education and other social reforms.

The material feminists who elaborated their daring schemes between the Civil War and the Great Depression were inspired by the optimism generated by nineteenth century beliefs in evolution, progress and unlimited technological innovations. The new urban space was to reflect these ideas and provide the setting for social and economic experiments. As domestic industries moved to factories, housework was to leave the home for communal kitchens, apartments houses, cooperative or commercial laundries and day care centres (there is little discussion of maintenance and cleaning which unfortunately couldn't be moved anywhere).
Numerous experiments followed along these lines. Whether organized cooperatively by housewives, or on a business basis by paid workers, communal eating was always cheaper than individual food preparation at home — a reflexion on the low cost of labour and bulk purchasing of foodstuffs. Yet from Melusina Fay Peirce in the 1860s to Jane Addams and Ethel Puffer Howes in the 1930s, these women underestimated the strength of capitalism and the growth of a consumer society which, Hayden maintains, eventually led to the demise of their alternative vision while consecrating suburban living and single family home ownership. Material feminists, Hayden shows, fell victim to Red-baiting and consumerism. In the meantime, the United States had witnessed dozens of experiments initiated if not by feminists themselves, by reformers, architects, trade-unionists or disgruntled housewives.

Hayden has chosen a subject of great relevance: Melusina Fay Peirce’s demand of wages for housework in 1868 sounds very familiar. Today’s feminists who regard domestic work by women in the nuclear family as an essential feature of patriarchal oppression are echoing a long line of women from Peirce to Mary Stevens Howland, Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Ethel Puffer Howes. One striking difference between these two waves of feminism is the inability of material feminists to challenge the sexual division of labour: whether transferred to cooperative undertakings or the care of experts, domestic chores they made the preserve of women.

We may ask ourselves if contemporary social and economic changes — the setting-up of fast-food services, laundromats, apartment buildings — have in fact taken place under the control of women, as wished by the material feminists. It would appear that women had diminishing influence as these innovations left the experimental stage to cater to mass consumption. Many of the material feminists had unrealistic expectations, although some visionaries foresaw that an increase in domestic appliances would not necessarily cut down on the time spent on housework unless also accompanied by a change of attitude towards housekeeping. Witness today’s sophistication in food preparation at home where food processors succeed food blenders for a more complicated recipe. Hayden has a message for feminists: for her the issue of housework is so fundamental that its neglect by present-day feminists may have weakened their cause.

Of interest to urban historians are the spatial consequences of the material feminists’ schemes on urban communities, the planning of new neighbourhoods and their infrastructures. The erection of apartment buildings favoured the introduction of communal services, even of kitchenless homes. Unfortunately, as more collective services developed, feminist filiation was not always evident, and with the enshrinement of post-World War II suburban living, the failure of feminist considerations to influence design and architecture is self-evident.

This book, in which the author attempts so many connections, is full of facts gleaned from a variety of private papers, obscure publications, and the rereading and reinterpretation of better known collections. A large number of illustrations complete a fascinating narrative.

Among the brilliant insights, the reader also finds dubious assertions. For instance, many would dispute Hayden’s contentions that nuclear energy was developed to meet the increasing demand for domestic consumption (p. 23), or that free love is “the demand that women control their own sexuality and reproduction” (p. 205). It was more than that. If Hayden’s work is not free of contradictions, it remains a milestone in the historiography of American feminism and architecture and design.
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Steppin’ Out is the first scholarly study of nightlife in the leading American metropolis or, for that matter, in any major American city. Previously explored only by popular writers and gossip columnists, this fascinating segment of modern urban culture has now finally received serious, sophisticated, and, not least important, sympathetic academic treatment. For Lewis Erenberg, a historian at Chicago’s Loyola University, has presented nightlife — its history, values, institutions and leading figures — as reflecting not the pathology of urban culture, as have so many others, but its positive expression, its unique identity. Contrary to generations of evangelical preachers, genteel critics and even social workers, nightlife, he claims, was a healthy, prolonged rebellion against Victorianism in America: in particular, its social and sexual rigidities; its restriction of respectable women to the home; and its double standards for males vs. females, whites vs. blacks, and native-born vs. foreign-born citizens.

One might casually associate New York City nightlife with the 1920s, the “Jazz Age.” Erenberg, however, carefully shows that decade to have been not its beginning but its culmination, at least until the post-World War II era. He traces the successive development of (1) Fifth Avenue restaurants and hotels; (2) Broadway “lobster palaces”; (3) cabarets, cafes, vaudeville houses, ragtime parlors, and movie theatres; (4) individual entertainers and their establishments; (5) revues; and (6) nightclubs. He emphasizes the gradual rise of a public realm of culture separate from the traditional private realm based in the home. One result of