

Ouvrage incontournable pour mieux connaître le pays saint-pierrais au XIX^e siècle, Jocelyn Morneau fait oeuvre de géographie historique en associant l'espace dans la démonstration de sa thèse. La présence du fleuve Saint-Laurent — et du lac Saint-Pierre — dans le mode de vie des habitants influent directement dans leurs activités qu'elles soient tournées vers l'agriculture orientée vers les marchés extérieurs, l'industrie rurale ou l'activité maritime. En ce sens, la contribution de Morneau est intéressante puisqu'elle propose aux chercheurs d'autres pistes de recherches comme l'étude des échanges et de la vie de relations pour comprendre la dynamique entourant l'agriculture et la montée des industries rurales au XIX^e siècle. Soutenus par une bibliographie étoffée et une importante section d'annexes, la démonstration s'appuie sur des cartes thématiques, des tableaux, des graphiques et des photographies d'époque illustrant bien les phénomènes observés. Par contre, certaines cartes thématiques demeurent difficiles à lire lorsqu'elles partagent la même page (p.70) au lieu de les répartir sur une seule page comme dans le cas de cartes de localisations (p. 291). Par ailleurs, il aurait été intéressant de souligner au passage la présence d'amérindiens (Abénaquis) sur les bords du lac Saint-Pierre et de leurs contributions à la vie de relations dans le pays saint-pierrais, notamment dans le secteur de la pêche et de la main d'oeuvre.

Pierre Poulin
Université Laval

Farley Reynolds, Sheldon Danziger, and Harry J. Holzer — *Detroit Divided*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2000. Pp. 309.

Detroit has become a complicated symbol of urban America. Once the Arsenal of Democracy where working-class Americans, regardless of colour, made more money than anywhere else in the country, Detroit has become the most racially and economically divided metropolitan region in the nation. America's Motor City, Detroit once embodied the nation's industrial power, producing America's favourite consumer durable for a seemingly insatiable market. Now Detroit represents something very different indeed. To sociologist Sharon Zukin, Detroit is the ironic symbol of the failure of modernism: the de-industrialized landscape a reminder of the fragility of the capitalist dream (Zukin, 1991). To others, it represents the ultimate failure of social justice programmes, where blacks and whites do not enjoy the same choices and so do not experience the same America (Sugrue, 1996). Detroit seems to be at once two cities: the inhospitable home of some of the country's poorest black Americans and the exciting Renaissance City, home to the glamour of casino gambling and the hope of growth-coalition boosterism. Effectively segregated into a poor, black downtown surrounded by affluent white suburban communities, metropolitan Detroit presents stark contrasts that have forced politicians, historians, social scientists, and policy analysts to ask the same question: how did this happen?

Reynolds Farley, Sheldon Danziger, and Harry J. Holzer once again pose this question in *Detroit Divided*. Self-described economists, demographers, and policy

analysts, the three authors explore why Detroit has become so racially, economically, and geographically polarized. While not explicitly intended as a comparative work, *Detroit Divided* inherently implies comparison. An implicit question in this work, as in many studies of the city, is “what makes Detroit unique?” The authors argue that, while similar political and economic forces have been at work in metropolitan regions across the nation, Detroit seems particularly vulnerable to a combination of factors: historical developments, changing labour market trends, persistent residential segregation, and racial animosity and mistrust. If the same social and economic forces are at work across the country, the authors ask, why is Detroit so much more polarized than other cities? *Detroit Divided* begins with the premise that Detroit is different from other American cities; much of the study is intended to show how it is different.

Part of the Russell Sage Foundation’s Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, *Detroit Divided* clearly is guided by the intentions and questions of the larger project: to “study the effects of massive economic restructuring on racial and ethnic groups in the inner city, who must compete for increasingly limited opportunities in a shifting labor market while facing persistent discrimination in housing and hiring”. Since the objective of the larger study has already identified a particular set of social problems, the various case studies can, at best, simply illustrate the degree to which cities experience these problems. In this context, there is no question that racial and ethnic groups face discrimination, but what does that mean in social and economic terms for urban America?

The results of the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality clearly are intended to influence social policy and future planning decisions in the metropolitan regions studied; the authors of *Detroit Divided* dedicate a chapter to recommendations for future urban planning. Supported by the Ford Foundation as well as the Russell Sage Foundation, the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality explores race and class in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles. The choice of four very different cities in different regions of the country suggests that Detroit is not unique: inequality is an American urban experience.

While conforming to the objectives of the larger collection, the authors of the Detroit study also ask, “are the problems of the urban poor due largely to changes in the nation’s labor market, to their own reluctance to take advantage of available opportunities, or to racial discrimination?” (p. 5). Certainly, these questions are not new. Indeed, identifying who, or what, is to blame for economic and social polarization in urban centres in the United States has inspired countless social science inquires since the 1960s. On the premise of the progressive notion that social science inquiry can direct genuine solutions, cities like Detroit have been collecting reams of demographic data for the past half-century. Urban planners, boosters, and community groups have used these data to suggest a wide array of diagnoses and treatments. Yet, while mapping inequality proves endlessly interesting to public policy writers, ending inequality remains elusive.

Neither the methods nor the sources these authors employ are new. *Detroit Divided* relies heavily on census data. In addition, the authors use the University of Michigan’s Detroit Area Study as the core of their research, a project that has gath-

ered data from a random sample of residents of the metropolis every year since the early 1950s (p. 4). The authors are very careful to point out the limitations of their research: the difficulties of using census data over several decades when census questions or collection techniques changed so dramatically. Even so, Farley, Danziger, and Holzer use few primary sources beyond demographic data; they rely heavily on the work of historians to create the context. Sprinkled with inset “vignettes” about race from Detroit’s past, the chapter on Detroit’s history reduces the city’s past to five major “turning-points” or “brief moments when great changes with long lasting consequences occurred” (pp.19–20). These five turning points are teleological: they outline a city that becomes steadily more racially divided. The chapter reads like a “great moments” condensed version of the city’s past; the inset stories serve as a distraction from the prose and seem added more for the sake of curiosity than context.

What makes this study different is its metropolitan focus. The authors of *Detroit Divided* are not merely interested in mapping inequality in Detroit, but in understanding the spatial, social, and economic relationships between the city and the metropolitan region. The comparisons are compelling. In particular, the addition of an employer survey designed to illuminate the demand side of the Detroit labour market provides an interesting foil for the largely perception-driven survey of the workers’ perspective. The juxtaposition of the two surveys makes the labour market analysis the strongest part of the book. The combination also seems to offer data that can immediately translate into social policy. For example, the employer survey allows the authors to break down labour market demand not only by education, as the census has forced scholars to do in the past, but also by skills (p. 113). Adult training programmes could be designed around these “skill mismatches”, and the authors offer several models for improving the Detroit educational system (p. 256).

Still, translating the results into policy becomes the weakest piece of the book. Strangely, these social scientists, who have shown so clearly how African Americans in Detroit are overwhelmingly employed in low-paid, service-sector jobs, argue that “new stadiums, office buildings, and increased tourism are crucial if the city is to regain its vitality and prosperity” (p.13). They cite no evidence to suggest this, nor do they offer examples of other cities that have successfully implemented such a “pro-growth” approach or specifically how that approach may offer better opportunities for the poor residing within the city.

Farley, Danziger, and Holzer argue for strategies that pertain to the supply side of the labour market, mobility, labour market demand, and anti-discrimination, all of which have been proposed before. They acknowledge that “hopes for this kind of urban revival have been a feature of policy debates for the past thirty-five years”, but they do not explain why they feel these strategies will be more successful now (p. 252). The authors wisely conclude that Detroit’s fate is dependent on “the nation’s fundamental economic trends, changes in government policies regarding cities, and the civic values that Americans hold or reject” (p. 249). Yet they entertain the possibility that the commemoration of Detroit’s 300th birthday in July 2001 would “generate the commitment and the will to diminish Detroit’s racial, spatial, and economic divide” (p. 265). As Detroit braces for yet another automobile manu-

facturing slowdown, a new Republican White House, and the consequences of casino gambling, it is very difficult to share their optimism.

Julie Longo
Wayne State University

D. P. (Pat) Stephens — *A Memoir of the Spanish Civil War: An Armenian-Canadian in the Lincoln Battalion. Edited and with an Introduction and Afterword by Rick Rennie.* St. John's, Newfoundland: Canadian Committee on Labour History, 2000. Pp. 119.

Douglas Patrick (Pat) Stephens was one of the roughly 1,400 Canadians who joined the International Brigades and fought in the Spanish Civil War against the forces of General Francisco Franco. Stephens was a member of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion of the 15th Brigade in Spain and saw active duty from 1937 to early 1939. His first-hand account of the war will be of particular interest to historians of the International Brigades in the Spanish Civil War, to historians of the Communist Party of Canada, and to general readers who are interested in soldiers' accounts of their combat experiences.

Stephens was born in Armenia in 1910 and emigrated with his family to Canada in 1926. Like many Canadians, he was hard hit by the Depression and moved from job to job from 1929 to 1936. He volunteered for the war in December 1936, using his association with Roy Davis, who was the Chief Organizer of the Young Communist League in Toronto. He and Davis had met through Stephens's connections in the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. Davis introduced Stephens to the Moscow-trained Communist Stanley Buchanan. Stephens was approved only after he had submitted a short autobiography and a statement about his and his family's political and financial disposition and had met with a certain Comrade John from the Recruiting Committee. He travelled to Spain via New York and Paris, arriving on February 14, 1937. He started as a machine gunner, moved on to a supply post position, and eventually served as a military investigator. Shortly before the war ended, Stephens was hospitalized because of a wound to his right hand that had festered. This marked the end of his combat experience in the Spanish Civil War. The memoir ends with Stephens's arrival in Newhaven, Britain, where he learned, through newspaper headlines, "Barcelona Fallen to Franco". It concludes with the line, "That was the sad end of my romantic attempt to make the world safe for democracy" (p. 117). This statement perfectly illustrates a number of unanswered issues and questions that face the reader; in this case, one is not certain whether the comment contains any irony.

Stephens does not address the fact that, while he may have thought that he was making the world "safe for democracy", he had in this battle allied himself with the Stalinist Soviet Union, which was anything but democratic. He served as a military investigator under the command of the SIM (*Servicio de Investigación Militar*) (p. 93), which was the Communist-dominated counter-espionage agency that operated