

This is a rich volume, full of excellent insights that are grounded in an historical approach. Perhaps the introductory chapter (Clark and Jauhiainen) should have been a little braver in stating what was and what was not possible to achieve and it would also have helped to have had a conclusion that commented on some of the main issues. There are some excellent illustrations but their use is diminished by being placed altogether rather than throughout the text. But overall, this is a valuable, pioneering volume on a subject which historians need, more and more, to address. It will be invaluable for students and should be in every university library.

Helen Meller

University of Nottingham

Robert M. Fogelson, *Bourgeois Nightmares: Suburbia, 1870–1930*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005. viii + 264pp. Bibliography. \$30.00; £18.95.
doi:10.1017/S0963926807294532

Robert Fogelson's new book, *Bourgeois Nightmares*, is a welcome addition to American suburban history. It is welcome not so much for what is new. There is little here that the well-read historian does not already know. Even when he does venture outside of the secondary literature it is to dip into well-used archives, such as those of the Olmsted family and the J.C. Nichols Company. Rather the strength of the book lies in two things. First, Fogelson brings together evidence of the imposition of restrictive covenants across the suburban landscape for the first time since the end of World War II. All of us believe that restrictive covenants were a critical element in the social composition and design of the suburbs. However, until now we did not have an accessible and up-to-date account of the specific restrictions imposed on the residential landscape. In this well-written study, Fogelson brings his considerable learning and talents to laying out the origins (late eighteenth century to the 1880s) and full-scale development (1880s to 1930) of restrictive covenants. Second, he provides a wealth of detail. From the expensive, well-designed, upper-class districts of Roland Park (Baltimore) and Palos Verdes (Los Angeles) to the more mundane middle-class suburban areas of many other cities, we are treated to a thick description of the actual content and workings of restrictive covenants. Fogelson's argument is that restrictive covenants are the dark side of the bourgeois utopia. As nightmares, restrictions represent 'deep-seated fears' (p. 123) that became part of everyday life at the end of the nineteenth century. Despite the dreams attached to building suburbia, Americans faced a fear of the market, of change and of each other. Fogelson makes this argument in two long chapters. The first shows how the rise of restrictive covenants lay in the search for permanence that Americans sought in the face of rapid neighbourhood change and the search for profit. The second chapter discusses in great detail the apparatus and character of the restrictions. In doing this, Fogelson takes us to many of the well-known and a few less-known suburban developments. In the process, the book raises several important issues about the formation and maintenance of residential space in one capitalist society.

Despite its strengths there are a few areas the reviewer felt could have been strengthened. For Fogelson, the end of the nineteenth century is the critical time when Americans came to accept that constraints and regulations could and should

be imposed on private property. However, even though the author provides some of the reasons for the development of restrictions in this period, this reviewer was left wanting to know more about the forces driving the increased popularity of regulating and controlling residential space. What, in Fogelson's view, accounts for the transformation of the consciousness of the home buyer between 1880 and 1920? How did the sanctity of private property become less important? Why did the fears become operative at this time? The reason that he gives, the desire for permanence in the face of rapid change, may well be true, but the point needs to be more forcefully made and with more evidence. Similarly, he makes a powerful claim that restrictive covenants were universal by the inter-war period, at least in America's burgeoning middle-class districts. Statements such as 'by the 1920s many middle-class subdivisions were restricted' (p. 77) litter the study. There can be little doubt that a proportion of the suburban middle class (and some of the working class as well) lived under restrictive covenants. However, Fogelson makes no attempt to provide any evidence for just how many. Nor does he show how many lived under rigorous and less rigorous restrictions. Despite these limitations, Fogelson has written a wonderfully accessible, interesting, timely and important book that will appeal to the student and to the academic.

R. Lewis

University of Toronto

John Welshman, *Underclass: A History of the Excluded 1880–2000*. London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006. xxix + 271pp. Bibliography. £25.00.
doi:10.1017/S0963926807304537

The idea of an 'underclass' has been an important part of poverty discourses over the last 120 years. In this book, John Welshman performs a valuable service in tracing its reconstructions from the late nineteenth-century concept of the 'residuum' right up to New Labour's redefinition of poverty as 'social exclusion'. In the process, he implicitly asks the question: what continuities and discontinuities can be observed as every generation seems to rediscover its own 'underclass'?

A variety of late nineteenth-century social commentators were convinced that a growing 'residuum' existed in densely populated urban areas. (Interestingly, in Britain there was not the same discussion of a 'rural residuum' as occurred in the USA.) Yet it remained an elusive, chimerical concept, unamenable to empirical verification, and co-existing uneasily (for example, in the writings of Charles Booth) alongside more economic analyses that located the causes of poverty in structural factors such as the trade cycle. Indeed, some later poverty investigators (notably, Rowntree and Bowley) remained little influenced by it. However, the inter-war years witnessed the rise of eugenics: hereditarian models of transmission appeared to demonstrate that there was a 'social problem group' that was growing in size. Yet empirical studies (such as that by E.J. Lidbetter) were vague and speculative – and certainly insufficiently convincing to muster enough public or political support for suggested remedies such as voluntary sterilization. As Welshman rightly argues, inter-war eugenics is more interesting for its symbolic importance than for its tangible achievements.

Drawing on his already-published and important articles on the 'problem family' concept of the 1940s and 1950s, Welshman then analyses this next reconstruction, exploring the tensions that existed between the three principal participants in the