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stepping stone he uses to launch his analysis of the future metropolis. Here Jones appears to add little that is new or creative. His city of the future occupies vast expanses of the earth’s surface, often ignoring national boundaries. It is the antithesis of the traditional city which was ordered and often contained within a wall. The scale is immense and Jones’ term “amorphous sprawl” is appropriate, but adds little that has not already been discussed in Doxiades’ idea of ecumenopolis.

Many previous books concentrate almost entirely on the spectacular and the splendid of the Metropolis. Jones, however, has the courage to confront the problems that come with size and greatness. The last two chapters highlight the congestion, poverty, inequality and squalor so common to parts of nearly all great cities. This provides a realistic but sobering contrast to the glamour usually associated with historical cities.

We should congratulate Jones for a book that is informative and analytical as well as interesting and literate. It adds considerably to our knowledge and understanding of the world’s great cities. Professionals and academics alike with an interest in urban issues will find this useful reading.
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Municipal politicians are rarely given the attention they merit; the arena does not seem important enough. The resurgence of political biographies, which recently were passé, is not likely to change that situation, although people like to read about their name politicians. A left-wing politician is even less likely to gain recognition from the traditional parties or academics even if that politician had been on the political scene for more than four decades as Joe Zuken had. Smith has offered a sympathetic and sensitive picture of his subject, who after constantly battering against the establishment and its machinery, including the media, remained “a confirmed Canadian socialist.”

One will not find here any information on the internecine strife in the Communist Party; it is almost as if Zuken was untouched by it or uninterested, which seems unlikely since his brother was as intimately involved as he was. This is hinted at by the author but little probing is done. Others, from Penner (Canadian Communism) to Angus (Canadian Bolsheviks) to White (A Hard Man to Beat) to Scott (A Communist Life), have documented it.

Zuken’s evolution is chronicled from the time of the family’s arrival in Canada from Russia in 1914 until his death in 1986. It is a biography of a socialist activist who “wove himself deep into the heart of the community.” The early years of recessions, depressions, war, the Winnipeg General Strike, anti-socialism and socialist red-baiting were the crucible of Zuken’s growth. His career was a series of successes: scholastically, as a lawyer, a municipal politician on the Winnipeg School Board, and then the Council during the Cold War. But the achievements take on greater significance as he travelled the untraditional route by fixing his future to the left rather than the mainstream.

Being poor may be subjective, but there are certain factors that should have raised questions for Smith. Zuken’s family lived in the working class district—but did that make them poor? They had an automobile, a luxury the poor could ill-afford in the 1920s and 1930s; indeed it was only in the 1950s or 60s that an automobile became possible for them. Attending university is another element. Very few of the working poor made their way there, even as late as the 1950s and 60s; secondary or technical schools seemed the highest level to which they could aspire and the counsellors reaffirmed that. Reading material came from local libraries, if they were aware of them, or discards in the garbage of the wealthy. His family was petit bourgeois—but that does not diminish his accomplishments.

Additional background is offered in a brief view of life during the 1930s depression and his involvement with the drama productions of the Progressive Arts Club and the Workers’ Education Theatre. These were attempts to generate an awareness of what was happening and why. This work reinforced his beliefs in his activities.

The socialist traits are well documented although they are not offered as a coherent whole. He was a humanist, an involved activist, an egalitarian, a believer in workers’ control, a supporter of the dialectic in education, and he recognized the blatant class distinctions that existed in Canada and approached issues from that perspective. A utopian optimist, he perceived a better world for the poor, the disadvantaged and those less able to defend themselves against the onslaught of the system, and he helped them in their battles. Those ideologies and beliefs characterized his career as a lawyer and politician.

Zuken and his brother gravitated towards the CP, a direction that seemed to be
more pertinent in trying to correct the abuses in society, particularly during the Great Depression. In this regard they were in good company with such people as Dorothy Livesay and others. The brother became a known organizer while Joe used his skills in the court room to defend CPers in labour battles or against state oppression, as occurred in WWII when CP leaders were interned.

But it was not just as a defender of the CP that he made his mark. There was a wide range of interests that attracted him as Dorothy Livesay and others. The Great Depression. In this regard they defended CPers in labour battles or against state oppression, as occurred in WWII when CP leaders were interned.

Zuken faced constant taunts of being a communist and adhering to the CP. The name calling and redbaiting were not veiled, and invariably demonstrated the accusers' ignorance of socialism as a philosophy and ideology in that they were consistent with their fellow Canadians.

Smith raises questions about Zuken's allegiance over the years to the CP in spite of the traumatic and overt contradictory positions it took. His was not a blind adherence, yet Smith forgets to point out that politicians are consistent; almost all endorse their political parties despite their blatant flip-flops; the few who do not, give proof to the rule. Zuken is thus not uncommon.

There is perhaps a question of proportion in the biography. A number of points on the early background of Winnipeg could have been omitted readily or cut without any loss; other aspects require clarification. In the later period, from the 1950s on, could more not have been devoted to the impact of the immigration or the ideologies that prevailed in Winnipeg? And Zuken undoubtedly was selfless in his work and influenced a number of people by his actions, and by all indications was poorly paid. Whatever wealth he accumulated indicates either he was a better manager than was believed or his wife Clara did an excellent job of managing the household since they made frequent trips. The Zuken story takes on some of the Horatio Alger mythology: the boy from the poor family who made it, which is not quite the case. Even though he criticized the system, he worked within it; there is little to indicate that he was prepared to overthrow it. That does not diminish what he had to struggle against but it does suggest that perhaps he became an advanced social democratic reformer accepting the mixed economy. Regardless, the story needed to be told.
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A recent review by Julian Gwyn, in the *Canadian Journal of History* (XXV, December 1990), made short work of Nicholas Rogers' discussion of extra-Parliamentary reform politics in English cities during the early Hanoverian period. Gwyn informed the reader that "gross corruption" characterized English politics "until after 1885," and that "until electoral bribery ends and limits on electoral spending are imposed, political reform is of small moment to historians." Moreover, we are told that "English politics in 1714-1760 do not lead anywhere that any ordinary reader wishes to be taken." Well, while corruption may be deplorable, it has seldom been regarded as a veto on historical enquiry, and it was, after all, partly a growing perception of corruption that gave impetus to early reform politics.

Politicization has often been (perhaps as Gwyn would have it) interpreted too narrowly, on the one hand, to indicate initiation into the official sort of political activity. On the other hand, historians have also sought its signs with