

David Harvey — *The Urbanization of Capital*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985. Pp. xvii, 239.

In this two-volume work David Harvey presents an interpretation of urbanization under capitalism based on the thought of Karl Marx. His close reading of Marx's writing leads him to discover that certain passages contain hints of spatial reasoning. These he seizes upon "to bring spatial relations and geographical phenomena explicitly into the main corpus of Marxian thought and to trace the effects of such an insertion upon our interpretations of fundamental concepts" (*Urbanization*, p. 34). In chapters that explore Marx's categories in relation to issues such as the allocation of land in cities, politics and planning in urbanizing conditions, and urban class structure Harvey conducts his exegetical exercise. He surveys modern social science literature intent upon his goal of interceding on behalf of his construction of Marx's thought. In his second volume he attempts to illustrate the application of his theory of capitalist urbanization with particular reference to nineteenth-century Paris. His study, "Paris, 1850- 1870", a monograph of 157 pages, is the most substantial of the essays not previously published. In all, five of a total of thirteen chapters appearing in print for the first time comprise three-fifths of the total text.

The essay on Paris from 1850 to 1870 is the centrepiece of Harvey's interpretive enterprise. The dates are significant: he studies the period between 1848 and the Commune, between "a full-fledged crisis of overaccumulation...[when] reform of capitalism or its revolutionary overthrow stared everyone starkly in the face" (*Consciousness*, p. 64) and "the tragedy" of the failure in "the final act of ferocious farce" of "a revolutionary organization capable of uniting many disparate elements within the dispersed space of Paris" (*Consciousness*, p. 217). Harvey focuses on neither the events of 1848 nor the Commune, touching upon them only briefly. His concern is with the drama that unfolded between these modern benchmarks. This was the Paris of the Second Empire, of Haussman, of bourgeois amenities and of regions for an uprooted working class. Paris was being transformed to meet the demands of capital through the agency of an authoritarian state organization, as Harvey sees it, and the result was a new consciousness among her contending classes. The events of the Commune were its bitter fruit.

How is the study undertaken? Harvey expresses a keen interest in understanding the interplay of experience and theory through an "historico-geographical" analysis. The process he describes as one of reflection, speculation and verification wherein "if verification has any meaning in the Marxist lexicon it lies in the open and productive qualities of this reflection and speculation in relation to political, class-based action" (*Consciousness*, p. xvi). His exploration begins with a brief overview of the reorganization of space relations, both of Paris with France and within the capital itself. This prefaces his treatment of "a theory of distribution (the splitting of surplus value into interest, rent and taxes)" (*Consciousness*, p. 68) in discussions of money and credit and finance, of rent and the propertied interest, and on the state. There follow treatments of abstract and concrete labour, the buying and selling of labour power, the condition of women, and the reproduction of labour power. Under the latter rubric Harvey delves into matters of nutrition, housing, education, and policing. The reader then comes to issues of class and community, and is introduced to the central question of how these may best be conceptualized. Evidence from statistics of inherited wealth is offered as one approach, the dichotomy between town and country as another. In the former the categories include "business", "high functionaries", "rentiers and pensioners", and "shopkeepers", among others. In the latter there is the "peasant class". The "lower classes" contain the "useless class" by one account.

The reader then encounters another approach to class, one using distinctions based on attitudes toward work, work skill, and discipline. The criteria of interest here are work habits, drink and society, life before marriage, economic condition, family life and politics; the typology includes "sublimes" and "true workers". There follow discussions of science and sentiment, of rhetoric and representation, and an *envoi* titled "The Geopolitics of Urban Transformation". In these final pages Harvey unites a prediction of Marx's with a spatially informed rendering of the politics of class interest: an illustration of his concept of verification in theory building.

The chapter hints at many possibilities; few are explored in satisfying depth. What, for instance, is the reader to learn from the sketches of a myriad of notions of class borrowed from other scholars' works? Why, having been introduced, are they swept aside, with no reference made to them in subsequent sections of the chapter? The gloss given to the concept of community likewise leaves the reader with little understanding of what Harvey intends to convey by it. Part of the problem for a critical reader is that Harvey is indebted to so many sources, contemporary to his study and modern. He shares none of his own critical assessments of the works, ranging from Zola to Zeldin, on which he relies so completely. The absence of this scholarly apparatus raises questions as to the meaning and value of many of the statements made.

The original essays which seek to expand Marx's writing into a fuller geographical account of urbanization likewise contain the fruits of an impressively wide reading. A great part of this is necessarily within the non-Marxist social sciences. The impression left with this reviewer is that the central view of urbanization has changed little after Harvey's massive translation of established research into a Marxist vocabulary. It may help educate Marxists who have not read the seminal papers; it is unlikely to persuade social scientists that fresh new insights await the adoption of a Marxist viewpoint.

These two volumes bring the fruits of much modern scholarship to bear on Marx's texts. The Paris of which Harvey writes was the Paris of which Marx wrote. The treatment of urbanization contains remarkably few references to recent Marxist writing. The essays offer suggestions whose broad applicability will await their being explored in a wider context.

Peter G. Goheen
Carleton University

* * *

Michael R. Marrus — *The Unwanted. European Refugees in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985. Pp. xiv, 414.

Michael Marrus's *The Unwanted* is a broad overview of the origins and international impact of European refugees, from Russian Jews in the 1800s to Poles in the 1980s. It makes for interesting, but often disheartening, reading.

Marrus argues that Europeans have only recently perceived refugees as a problem. Before the nineteenth century refugees were few in number, were generally welcomed as additional working hands, and soon either assimilated or died. The political exiles of the nineteenth century were sufficiently few — and sufficiently "respectable" in social origin — that they generally did not seem to constitute a "refugee" problem either. Only when many Jews began fleeing Eastern Europe after 1880, for a mix of economic and political motives, did the numbers become large enough (and identifiable enough) to be perceived as a social category separate from "emigrants" — and to seem a problem.

The first mass "refugee" movements, in the Balkans from 1878 on, were "by-products of the state-building process" (p. 49). As the Ottoman Empire collapsed, it and its successors struggled to mobilize their populations into cohesive groups supportive of state-defined goals. Ethnicity (or religion) became the basis of national identity and loyalty, and non-nationals became suspect. Those who could not or would not assimilate were dispensable.

World War I broadened the scope of state-building and added ideological to nationalistic pressures. Victims of political persecution from Russia joined ethnic minorities driven to or from all the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Caucasus. The clash of Turkish and Armenian nationalism had before World War I led to massacres and eventual genocide against the Armenians. After World War I the often violent Turkish and Russian opposition to Armenian self-determination