Urban History Review
Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Schwartz, L. D. *London in the Age of Industrialisation: Entrepreneurs, Labour Force and Living Conditions, 1700–1850*. (Cambridge Studies in Population, Economy and Society in Past Time). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Pp. xv, 285. 28 figures, 356 tables, bibliography, index

Craig Muldrew

Volume 23, numéro 2, march 1995

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1016639ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/1016639ar

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 compte rendu

Muldrew, C. (1995). Compte rendu de [Schwartz, L. D. *London in the Age of Industrialisation: Entrepreneurs, Labour Force and Living Conditions, 1700–1850*. (Cambridge Studies in Population, Economy and Society in Past Time). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Pp. xv, 285. 28 figures, 356 tables, bibliography, index]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, *23*(2), 56–57. https://doi.org/10.7202/1016639ar

Schwartz, L.D. *London in the Age of Industrialisation: Entrepreneurs, Labour Force and Living Conditions, 1700-1850.* (Cambridge Studies in Population, Economy and Society in Past Time). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Pp.xv, 285. 28 figures, 356 tables. bibliography, index.

In the conclusion to this wide ranging and very detailed study, Dr. Schwartz quotes J.L. Hammond to the effect that the industrial revolution was "a storm that passed over London and broke elsewhere." (231) Although the title is *London in the Age of Industrialisation*, the book is an attempt to show why the massive economy of the metropolis did not industrialise to any great extent before 1850, remaining based on small scale artisanal units of production during the same period that changes were occurring in methods of production in northern cities. As the author puts it, conditions in London "militated against heavy capitalization", and instead strongly supported "an 'urban proto-industrialisation', using wherever possible the household as the unit of production-particularly under-employed labour within the household...." (207)

The study begins in 1700 so that changes can be examined on the basis of long term trends. Most of the evidence in the book is statistical, and the subjects examined are as varied as the social and occupational structure of trades in London, the employment of women, the effects of war on long term trade cycles, the effects of seasonality over the course of each year, long term trends in mortality and population growth, and finally, wage rates, standards of living, and conditions of employment and competition among workers. The book's basic theme is how long term demographic trends affected the London labour market, and in combining such fields of enquiry the book fits in well with the themes explored by others in this series.

Schwartz shows that the composition of London's huge labour force was dominated by the service industry and specialized manufacturing and finishing trades such as coachmaking, silkweaving, or watchmaking, to serve the market for luxury goods in the capital. Even in the census of 1851 the largest numbers of men were employed as porters or messengers, or in the drink and victualling trades. There were also a large number of lawyers and clerks, reflecting the importance of London as a legal center. Land tax records and innovative research on insurance policies are used to show how vast the gulf was between the wealthy elite members of the trades, and a "large number of the extremely uncomfortable" (43) who traded with very small profit margins. Most of the London poor were involved in such small scale trade, the poorest of whom were street sellers who might buy provisions in one part of town to sell them on the street in another. (44) Throughout the eighteenth century there was constant underemployment among poor artisans and traders in the capital because demand was very inconsistent. Seasonality of demand caused by the London season and winter could lead to high levels of periodic unemployment in many trades. But, Schwartz shows that because of lower mortality rates in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the market for labour in London became even more glutted in the nineteenth century. Poorer sweated labour proliferated in the manufacturing trades creating much more competitive markets for both goods and the labour that manufactured them.

Although real wages dropped precipitously in the late eighteenth century and first decade of the nineteenth century because of bad harvests and war, they rose after 1815 primarily because of a fortunate series of good harvests. This, combined with an influx of cheaper manufactured goods from the north led to a rise in real wages in London, which in turn led to a demand for cheaply produced artisans' goods made in the capital itself. (220) Most of this demand was met by sweated labour working in small family units who sold their cheaply produced goods to retailers, and who were able to operate independently of any control from guilds and wealthier artisans. Large integrated businesses did not develop before the end of the nineteenth century because rents were high, and because demand fluctuated too much to provide the needed capital to meet production costs. In this view the structure of London's economy does not appear that different in 1850 than it had been in 1700. Harvest fluctuations and demography were still more important than the effects of industrialization. What had changed, however, was that by the later date the labour market had become increasingly competitive. Real wages, though, were maintained because cheaper goods were being produced for widespread consumption.

This is an important thesis, and the author presents a large amount of statistical material to support it. Unfortunately it is not always as clearly presented as it might be, and the book is organized by individual section tied together at the end in the conclusion, rather than through a continuous narrative. This leads to some fragmentation of material through various sections, and some repetition as well. The statistical evidence is very carefully presented, although again this sometimes takes away from the force of the argument as on pages 57-73 where the evidence does not conclusively add to it.

The book would have read better if the excellent material on the conditions of labour in the last section had been more

closely integrated with the statistical material. (As was done on pp.117-121, in the fascinating section on the organization of labour markets in pubs.) There also might have been more evidence for the patterns of popular demand after 1815, as this is a key element of the thesis. But despite these faults, the book is of obvious importance because it argues that factors familiar to a seventeenth century urban historian such as population growth and demography continued to have the most influence on labour in the nation's largest market well into the nineteenth century, which came to be changed, as Adam Smith predicted, more by increased competition than by industrialisation.

Craig Muldrew
Cambridge University

Fairfield, John D. *The Mysteries of the Great City: The Politics of Urban Design, 1877-1937.* (Ohio State Urban Life and Urban Landscape Series). Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993. Pp. xi, 320, Illustrations. $35 (US).

Blackford, Mansel G. ***The Lost Dream: Businessmen and City Planning on the Pacific Coast, 1890-1920. (Ohio State Urban Life and Urban Landscape Series). Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993. Pp. xiii. 189. Illustrations. $58.50 (US).***

John D. Fairfield's The Mysteries of the Great City is an ambitious attempt to explore the development of American urban planning from Frederick Law Olmsted to the New Deal. Fairfield posits two "distinct traditions" in American urban reform, one based on "traditional republican and free labor values" exemplified by Olmsted and Henry George, the other a "realistic and pragmatic tradition" linked to the rise of corporate capitalism and best represented by Chicago School sociologist Robert E. Park. Fairfield traces efforts to shape American urban development in light of these two "traditions," ranging widely over vast tracts of American social, political and urban history and synthesizing much previous scholarship. His book offers a useful overview of many of the major texts and issues of the early years of American urban planning, and could serve as an introduction to its intellectual history.

Yet in his effort to situate the development of American planning discourse within such diverse realities of urban development as suburbanization, labor struggles, tenement reform, zoning and the politics of transit, Fairfield telescopes so much detailed urban and planning history that the thread of his argument sometimes becomes difficult to follow. His rapid march through the major moments in the development of American planning suggests—despite his cogent criticisms of the elitist nature of what he calls the "realist tradition"—that he is still writing within the intellectual parameters of the planning profession itself. While he makes a sustained effort to discuss the actual economic and political forces shaping urban development, his book, like much of the literature it considers, conveys little of the physical and social presence of specific American cities and neighborhoods in this period, raising doubts about its subtitle, "The Politics of Urban Design."

In fact the book is more focused on the politics and social context of the planners themselves than on specific urban design outcomes, and its broad scope makes very different urban social and physical contexts seem to blur together. Only when Fairfield turns to the development of Park's Chicago School of Sociology and in the process gives us a place-specific account of the importance of the 1919 Chicago race riots in spurring interest in urban problems does he fully convey a sense of the relationship between planning ideas and a particular urban social reality, but even here his focus quickly returns to planner–sociologists like Clarence Perry and their influential but abstract paradigm of the neighborhood unit. To continue to examine the specific interfaces between physical and social reality and the planners' ideas in the entire period covered by the book would of course mean either an exhaustingly encyclopedic study or a less ambitious historical scope, but either might have led to more new insights into the often familiar material.

There is no question that American planners have had a considerable influence on American urban development, but it is also evident that both "traditions" Fairfield identifies basically failed to achieve their ambitious goals. While Fairfield's book is a step towards better explaining the actual social, economic and political context of American planning, its very broad historical scope and continuing focus on the ideas of the planners themselves means than more difficult historical work is still needed to understand the complex and often tragic relationship between planners' intentions and the social and physical results that remain with us.

Mansel Blackford's *The Lost Dream*, on the other hand, aims to provide an account of the relationship between businessmen and efforts at city planning in San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, Seattle and Portland, Oregon between 1890 and 1920. While the five cities under discussion are unquestionably similar in all being sited on the Pacific Coast, it is not clear that the five are best compared with each other. As Blackford himself says, these cities "were hardly unique" in expanding post-Civil War America; it might have been more illuminating, as Gunther Barth and others have done, to seek affinities in their develop-