We propose a network analytic approach to the community question in order to separate the study of communities from the study of neighborhoods. Three arguments about the community question—that "community" has been "lost," "saved," or "liberated"—are reviewed for their development, network depictions, imagery, policy implications, and current status. The lost argument contends that communal ties have become attenuated in industrial bureaucratic societies; the saved argument contends that neighborhood communities remain as important sources of sociability, support and mediation with formal institutions; the liberated argument maintains that while communal ties still flourish, they have dispersed beyond the neighborhood and are no longer clustered in solidary communities. Our review finds that both the saved and liberated arguments proposed viable network patterns under appropriate conditions, for social systems as well as individuals.

NETWORKS, NEIGHBORHOODS, AND COMMUNITIES
Approaches to the Study of the Community Question

BARRY WELLMAN
BARRY LEIGHTON
Centre for Urban and Community Studies
and
Department of Sociology
University of Toronto

NEIGHBORHOOD OR COMMUNITY?

Urban sociology has tended to be *neighborhood sociology.* This has meant that analyses of large-scale urban phenomena (such as the fiscal crisis of the state) have been neglected in favor of small-scale studies of communities. It has also meant that the study of such communities has been firmly rooted in the study of neighborhoods, be they the "symbiotic" communities of Park

AUTHORS' NOTE: *Preparation of this paper has been supported by the Canada Ministry of Manpower and Immigration (Young Canada Works Program), the Centre for Urban and Community Studies,*

URBAN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY, Vol. 14 No. 3, March 1979, 363-390

(1936) or the "street corners" of Liebow (1967). It is to the sorting out of this second tendency, the merger of "neighborhood" with "community" that we address this paper.

There are a number of reasons why the concept of "neighborhood" has come to be substituted for that of "community":

First, urban researchers have to start somewhere. The neighborhood is an easily identifiable research site, while the street corner is an obvious and visible place for mapping small-scale interaction.

Second, many scholars have interpreted the neighborhood as the microcosm of the city and the city as an aggregate of neighborhoods. They have emphasized the local rather than the cosmopolitan in a building block approach to analysis which has given scant attention to large-scale urban structure.

Third, administrative officials have imposed their own definitions of neighborhood boundaries upon urban maps in attempts to create bureaucratic units. Spatial areas, labeled and treated as coherent neighborhoods, have come to be regarded as natural phenomena.

Fourth, urban sociology's particular concern with spatial distributions has tended to be translated into local area concerns. Territory has come to be seen as the inherently most important organizing factor in urban social relations rather than just one potentially important factor.

Fifth, and most importantly, many analysts have been preoccupied with the conditions under which solidary sentiments can be maintained. Their preoccupation reflects a persistent overarching sociological concern with normative integration and consensus. The neighborhood has been studied as an apparently obvious container of normative solidarity.

For these reasons at least, the concentration on the neighborhood has had a strong impact on definitions of, research on, and theorizing about community. Neighborhood studies have pro-

---

University of Toronto (Urban Housing Markets Program), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

We have profited from the comments of the Toronto structural analysis group, Walter Phillips, Charles Tilly and Harrison White in developing our ideas. Edward Lee and Christina Marmoreo gave us careful line-by-line criticism of an earlier draft.

duced hundreds of finely wrought depictions of urban life, and they have given us powerful ideas about how small-scale social systems operate in a variety of social contexts. But does the concept of "neighborhood" equal the concept of "community"? Are the two really one and the same?

Definitions of community tend to include three ingredients: *networks of interpersonal ties* (outside of the household) which *provide sociability and support* to members, residence in a *common locality*, and *solidarity sentiments and activities* (see Hillery, 1955). It is principally the emphasis on common locality, and to a lesser extent the emphasis on solidarity, which has encouraged the identification of "community" with "neighborhood."

Yet the paramount concern of sociologists is social structure, and concerns about the spatial location of social structures and their normative integration must necessarily occupy secondary positions. To sociologists, unlike geographers, spatial distributions are not inherently important variables, but assume importance only as they affect such social structural questions as the formation of interpersonal networks and the flow of resources through such networks.

THE COMMUNITY QUESTION

With its manifest concerns for the activities of populations in territories (Tilly, 1974), urban sociology has often seemed to stand apart from broader theoretical concerns. Yet its concentration on the study of the neighborhood-as-community is very much a part of a fundamental sociological issue. This fundamental issue, which has occupied much sociological thinking, is the *community question:* the study of how large-scale divisions of labor in social systems affect the organization and content of interpersonal ties.

Sociologists have been particularly concerned with that form of the community question which investigates the impact the massive industrial bureaucratic transformations of North America and Europe during the past two hundred years have had on a variety of primary ties: in the home, the neighborhood, the workplace, with kin and friends, and among interest groups. Have such ties attenuated or flourished in contemporary so-

cieties? In what sort of networks are they organized? Have the contents of such ties remained as holistic as alleged to be in pre-industrial societies or have they become narrowly specialized and instrumental?

The community question thus forms a crucial nexus between macroscopic and microscopic analysis. It directly addresses the structural integration of a social system and the interpersonal means by which its members can gain access to scarce resources. We urge, therefore, that the study of the community question be freed from its identification with the study of neighborhoods.

NEIGHBORHOOD ≠ COMMUNITY

The entangling of the study of community ties with the study of the neighborhood has created a number of problems for the analysis of the community question.

First, the identification of a neighborhood as a container for communal ties assumes the a priori organizing power of space. This is spatial determinism. Even if we grant that space-time costs encourage some relationships to be local, it does not necessarily follow that all communal ties are organized into solidary neighborhood communities. These neighborhood ties may exist because of the attraction of ready accessibility to a few people and not because of a tangible neighborhood social organization.

Second, even the presence of many local relationships does not necessarily create discrete neighborhoods. There may well be overlapping sets of local ties, the range of these ties being affected by the needs and physical mobility of the participants.

Third, the identification of neighborhood studies with community studies can omit major spheres of interaction. There are important ties outside of the neighborhood even in the most "institutionally complete community" (Breton, 1964). Perhaps work relationships are the most serious and prevalent omission from community studies: residents tend to disappear from view in the morning and mysteriously reappear at dusk.

Fourth, the focus on the neighborhood may give undue importance to spatial characteristics as causal variables. Are cities just concrete and concentrated manifestations of larger structural forces? For instance, Castells (1976) argues that most Western

urban sociology can be explained by studying capitalist modes of production.

Fifth, many analyses of neighborhoods have been preoccupied with the conditions under which solitary sentiments can be maintained. Consequently, when there has been an observed lack of locally organized behavior and sentiments, the assumption has easily been made that community has decayed. When not found in the neighborhood, community is assumed not to exist.

THE NETWORK PERSPECTIVE

We suggest that the *network analytic perspective* is a more appropriate response to the community question in urban studies than the traditional focus on the neighborhood.[1] A network analysis of community takes as its starting point the search for social linkages and flows of resources. Only then does it enquire into the spatial distribution and solidary sentiments associated with the observed linkages. Such an approach largely frees the study of community from spatial and normative bases. It makes possible the discovery of network-based communities which are neither linked to a particular neighborhood nor to a set of solidary sentiments.

However, the network perspective is not inherently antineighborhood. By leaving the matter of spatial distributions initially open, this perspective makes it equally as possible to discover an "urban village" (Gans, 1962) as it is to discover a "community without propinquity" (Webber, 1963). A network analysis might also tell us that strong ties remain abundant and important, but that they are rarely located in the neighborhood. With this approach we are then better able to assess the position of neighborhood ties within the context of overall structures of social relationships.

The community question has been extensively debated by urban scholars. In this paper, we evaluate three competing scholarly arguments about the community question from a network perspective. The first two arguments to be discussed both focus on the neighborhood: the *community lost,* asserting the absence of local solidarities, and the *community saved* argument,

asserting their persistence. The *community liberated* argument, in contrast, denies any neighborhood basis to community. General tendencies in each argument are summarized, although not every article making each argument neatly fits into the analytic categories we have imposed on them. We review each argument's development, portrayal of urban networks, underlying normative imagery, policy implications, and current scholarly status. We conclude the paper by suggesting different circumstances in which saved and liberated network structures might be more prevalent and more useful.

COMMUNITY LOST

DEVELOPMENT

The community lost argument contends that the transformation of Western societies to centralized, industrial bureaucratic structures has gravely weakened primary ties and communities, making the individual more dependent on formal organizational resources for sustenance (see the reviews in Stein, 1960; Nisbet, 1962; Gusfield, 1975; Castells, 1976; Mellor, 1977). The first attempts to deal with the community question (e.g., Tönnies, 1887) were, at the turn of the century, closely associated with broader sociological concerns about the impact of the Industrial Revolution on communal ties and normative integration (e.g., Durkheim, 1893; Simmel, 1908).

Scholars working in the lost tradition have initiated the analysis of the impact of large-scale social changes upon community structures. A number of such significant changes have been suggested, although not all analysts proposing them would necessarily agree that the loss of community was the ultimate outcome:

(a) an increase in the scale of the nation-state's activities, with a concomitant decrease in local community autonomy and solidarity;
(b) the development of bureaucratic institutions for production and reproduction, which have taken over many family, neighborhood, and friendship activities;

(c) the large size of cities, which provides a basis for the population and organizational potential for more, and diverse, interest groups;
(d) the high social density of interactions among segments of the population (even where spatial density is decreasing), with the ensuing complexities of ecological sorting and social arrangements;
(e) the diversity of people with whom city dwellers can come into contact under conditions of heightened physical mobility;
(f) the proliferation of cheap, efficient, and widespread transportation and communication facilities, increasing the ease with which contact can be made and enabling urbanites to be less tied to the neighborhood. The increased velocity of transactions fosters interactional density, and links to multiple social circles are even more readily maintained.

The lost argument has had continuing academic attention. It underlay much of the 1920s-1930s theoretical writing of the dominant "Chicago school" of urban studies (although the Chicago scholars found much evidence of communal organization in their empirical work). Robert Park's early programmatic statement asserted that "the growth of cities has been accomplished by the substitution of indirect 'secondary' for direct, face-to-face 'primary relations' " (Park, 1925a: 23). Over a decade later, Louis Wirth (1938) summarized the lost argument well in his now classic statement of "urbanism as a way of life." Primary ties are recognized as still existing, but in a weaker, more narrowly instrumental fashion than those which had flourished in traditional solidary communities. More recent statements making the lost argument have not been as closely associated with empirical research but have been primarily concerned with normative theorizing and moralizing (e.g., Kornhauser, 1959; Nisbet, 1962; Banfield, 1968; Slater, 1970).

Lost scholars have seen modern urbanites as alienated isolates who bear the brunt of the transformed society on their own. Many research procedures have reinforced this perspective by using survey techniques which lump together individuals *qua* individuals in analytically imposed categories which do not take into consideration their structural connectedness (i.e., the statistical assumption of independence elevated to a world view). Such

individual-as-unit oriented research techniques have been particularly suited to social psychologistic explanations which see internalized attitudes as determining social activity; they have not been nearly as well-suited towards the direct study of social-structural effects.

LOST NETWORKS

The community lost argument makes a number of specific assertions about the kinds of primary ties, social networks, and community structures that will tend to be present under its assumptions. By casting the lost argument in network analytic terms, we shall be better able to evaluate it in comparison with the community saved and community liberated arguments:

(a) Rather than being a full member of a solidary community, urbanites are now *limited members* (in terms of amount, intensity, and commitment of interaction) of *several social networks.*
(b) Primary ties are *narrowly defined;* there are *fewer strands* in the relationship.
(c) The narrowly defined ties tend to be *weak in intensity.*
(d) Ties tend to be *fragmented* into isolated *two-person* relationships rather than being parts of extensive networks.
(e) Those networks that do exist tend to be *sparsely knit* (a low proportion of all potential links between members actually exists) rather than being densely knit (a high proportion of potential links exists).
(f) The networks are *loosely bounded;* there are few discrete clusters or primary groups.
(g) Sparse density, loose boundaries and narrowly defined ties provide *little* structural basis for *solidary activities or sentiments.*
(h) The narrowly defined ties dispersed among a number of networks create *difficulties in mobilizing assistance* from network members.

IMAGERY

Community lost imagery has had a good deal of scholarly impact, appealing to radical (e.g., Engels, 1845; Castells, 1976), liberal (e.g., Kornhauser, 1959; Stein, 1960; Slater, 1970), and

conservative (e.g., Nisbet, 1962; Banfield, 1968; Grant, 1969) concerns. Lost scholars of all political persuasions have been concerned about the upheavals caused by the large-scale transformation of industrial bureaucratic societies and the social disorganization and depravity allegedly let loose by the weakening of traditional communal bonds. Running through many lost analyses has been the implicit assumption that human beings are fundamentally evil (or easily capable of being driven to evil by industrialism, bureaucraticism, or capitalism), and that where restraining communal structures have been destroyed by the Industrial Revolution, riot, robbery, and rape have swept the city.

The social disorganization theme has remained a popular one in North American thought (for reviews, see White and White, 1962; Marx, 1964; Bender, 1978). Nostalgia for "the myth of the lost paradise" (Gusfield, 1975) has mingled with the identification of the contemporary city as the home of rootless masses in a continuing tradition from Jeffersonian pastoralism through Progressive reformism (e.g., Woodsworth, 1911) to such recent urban panic movies as "Death Wish" (1974). Affluent suburbs (see the review in Popenoe, 1977) as well as poor inner cities are despaired of as privatized, isolated, and alienated.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The community lost argument has significantly affected urban policy in North America and Western Europe. There have been extensive "community development" programs designed to end alienation and to grow urban roots, such as the putative War on Poverty. The desired community ideal in such programs has been the regeneration of the densely knit, tightly bounded, solidary neighborhood community. When, despite the programs, a return to the pastoral ideal has not seemed achievable, then despair about social disorganization has led to elaborate social control policies, designed to keep in check the supposedly alienated, irrational, violence-prone masses. When even the achievement of social control has not seemed feasible, policies of neglect—benign or otherwise—have developed. Administrators have removed services from inner-city neighborhoods, asserting their

inability to cope with socially disorganized behavior and leaving the remaining inhabitants to fend for themselves. The residents of such inner-city American areas as Pruitt-Igoe and the South Bronx have come to be regarded as unredeemably "sinful" as they suffer the supposed war of all against all.

CURRENT STATUS

The principal scholarly value of the community lost argument has been the attention it has focused on some important theoretical issues. First, it has sharpened perceptions of the ways in which industrial bureaucratic social systems can affect the nature of traditional communities. Second, it has raised the problem of the impact of residential and social mobility on the maintenance of community ties. Because it has seen community as only existing in neighborhoods, the lost argument has interpreted such mobility as a loss of community. However, if community becomes redefined in nonspatial terms, then the lost argument has served as an important precursor of the more recent community liberated argument (see below).

Despite its tenacity, the lost argument has received little empirical confirmation. Indeed, much of the impetus behind the saved and liberated arguments since World War II has been to disprove the loss of community contention (see the reviews in Craven and Wellman, 1973; Feagin, 1973; Hunter, 1975; Fischer, 1976). A modified version of the lost argument has recently emerged, taking into account the extensive documentation of primary ties that has been performed by saved and liberated scholars (see below). This modified lost version acknowledges the persistence of primary ties but contends that they are now markedly narrower in scope: the former wide range of content in kinship, neighborhood, and friendship ties has been reduced to sociability and emotional support, with formal institutions and the nuclear family now taking over much of the former content of such relationships (e.g., Sennett, 1970; Lasch, 1977). While this new version of the lost argument offers its scholars an opportunity to move from normative ideologizing to systematic investigations, extensive empirical confirmation of its contentions has not yet appeared.

COMMUNITY SAVED

DEVELOPMENT

The community saved argument maintains that neighborhood communities have persisted in industrial bureaucratic social systems as important sources of support and sociability. It argues that the very formal, centralizing tendencies of bureaucratic institutions have paradoxically encouraged the maintenance of primary ties as more flexible sources of sociability and support. The saved argument contends that urbanites continue to organize safe communal havens, with neighborhood, kinship, and work solidarities mediating and coping with bureaucratic institutions.

The saved argument shares with the lost argument the identification of "community" with "neighborhood." However, saved scholars have reacted against the tendency of some lost scholars to write secondary analyses *about* the neighborhood community rather than primary analyses *of* neighborhood communities.

In marked contrast to the lost argument scholar's proclivity for armchair theorizing, much of the saved argument's case has rested on the sheer empirical demonstration of the continued vitality of those urban primary ties which had been pronounced lost. Since World War II, hordes of scholars have presented carefully documented community studies, using systematic survey and field-work techniques, to make the saved argument. These studies have concentrated on delineating the social structure of neighborhood communities and have not just presented urbanites as aggregates of unconnected individuals. They have shown that urbanites still neighbor, still have a sense of local community, and still use neighborhood ties for sociability and support (see the reviews in Keller, 1968; Wellman and Whitaker, 1974; Warren and Warren, 1976; Fischer, 1976; Warren, 1978).

SAVED NETWORKS

The saved argument, cast into network analytic terms, is quite different from the lost argument:

(a) Urbanites tend to be *heavily involved members* of a *single neighborhood community,* although they may combine this with membership in other social networks.

(b) There are *multiple strands* of relationships between the members of these neighborhood communities.
(c) While network ties vary in intensity, many of them are *strong.*
(d) Neighborhood ties tend to be organized into *extensive networks.*
(e) Networks tend to be *densely knit.*
(f) Neighborhood networks are *tightly bounded,* with few external linkages. Ties tend to loop back into the same cluster of network members.
(g) High density, tight boundaries, and multistranded ties provide a structural basis for a good deal of *solidary activities and sentiments.*
(h) The multistranded strong ties clustered in densely knit networks *facilitate* the *mobilization* of assistance for dealing with routine and emergency matters.

IMAGERY

Saved scholars have tended to regard human beings as fundamentally good and inherently gregarious. They are viewed as apt to organize self-regulating communities under all circumstances, even extreme conditions of poverty, oppression, or catastrophe.

Hence the saved argument has shared the neighborhood community ideal with the lost argument, but it has seen this ideal as attainable and often already existing. Neighborhood communities are valued precisely because they can provide small-scale loci of interaction and can effectively mediate urbanites' dealings with large-scale institutions. Densely knit, tightly bounded communities are valued as structures particularly suited to the tenacious conservation of its internal resources, the maintenance of local autonomy, and the social control of members (and intruders) in the face of powerful impinging external forces (e.g., Jacobs, 1961; Newman, 1972).

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Public acceptance of the saved argument has greatly increased during the past two decades. Active neighborhood communities are now valued as antidotes to industrial bureaucratic societies' alleged impersonality, specialized relationships, and loss of comprehensible scale. "Streetcorner society" (Whyte, 1955),

"the urban village" (Gans, 1962), and "Tally's Corner" (Liebow, 1967) have become exemplars of saved communities.

The neighborhood unit has been the twentieth-century planning ideal for new housing. Saved ideologues have also argued the necessity for preserving existing neighborhoods against the predations of ignorant and rapacious institutions. The saved argument has been the ideological foundation of the neighborhood movement which seeks to stop expressways, demolish developers, and renovate old areas (e.g., Powell, 1972). Some neighborhoods have been successfully rescued from "urban renewal," although Gans' West End in Boston (1962) and Clairmont and Magill's Africville in Halifax (1974) have been lost.

In political analyses, rioters, far from being socially disorganized, are now seen to be rooted, well-connected community members (see Feagin and Hahn, 1973; Tilly, 1973, 1978). Their motivations tend to be in defense of existing communal interests or claims to new ones, rather than the irrational, individualistic, psychologistic responses claimed by the lost argument. Indeed, the means by which urbanites get involved in a riot are very much associated with the competitions, coalitions, and solidary ties of their social networks.

Many saved social pathologists have encouraged the nurturance of densely knit, bounded communities as a structural salve for the stresses of poverty, ethnic segregation, and physical and mental diseases (see the review in Caplan and Killilea, 1976; Ratcliffe, 1978). Getting help informally through neighborhood communities is alleged to be more sensitive to peculiar local needs and protective of the individual against bureaucratic claims. Furthermore, such programs have been welcomed by administrators as more cost-effective (or, as some critics allege, merely cheaper to operate) than the formal institutional intervention implied by the lost argument.[2]

CURRENT STATUS

In the early nineteen-sixties the saved argument became the new orthodoxy in community studies with the publication of such works as Gans' *The Urban Villagers* (1962), Greer's (1962) synthesis of postwar survey research, and Jacob's (1961) asser-

tion of the vitality of dense, diverse central cities. Such case studies as Young and Willmott's (1957) study of a working-class London neighborhood, Gans's (1967) account of middle-class, new suburban networks, and Liebow's (1967) portrayal of inner-city blacks' heavy reliance on network ties helped clinch the case.

The rebuttal of the lost argument's assertion of urban social disorganization has therefore been accomplished, theoretically and empirically, by studies emphasizing the persistence of neighborhood communities. In the process, though, the lost argument's useful starting point may have come to be neglected: that the industrial bureaucratic division of labor has strongly affected the structure primary ties. Saved scholars have tended to look only for—and at—the persistence of functioning neighborhood communities.[3] Consequently we now know that neighborhood communities persist and often flourish, but we do not know the position of neighborhood-based ties within overall social networks.

Many recent saved analyses have recognized this difficulty by introducing the "community of limited liability" concept, which treats the neighborhood as just one of a series of communities among which urbanites divide their membership (see Janowitz, 1952; Greer, 1962; Suttles, 1972; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Hunter, 1975; Warren, 1978). Hunter and Suttles (1972: 61), for example, portray such communities as a set of concentric zones radiating out from the block to "entire sectors of the city." However, while such analyses recognize the possibilities for urbanites to be members of diverse networks with limited involvement in each network, the "limited liability community" formulation is still predicated on the neighborhood concept, seeing urban ties as radiating out from a local, spatially defined base.

COMMUNITY LIBERATED

DEVELOPMENT

The third response to the community question, the liberated argument, agrees with the lost argument's contention that the

industrial bureaucratic nature of social systems has caused the weakening of neighborhood communities. But the liberated argument also agrees with the saved argument's contention that primary ties have remained viable, useful, and important. It shares the saved argument's contention that communities still flourish in the city, but it maintains that such communities are rarely organized within neighborhoods.

The liberated argument contends that a variety of structural and technological developments have liberated communities from the confines of neighborhoods and dispersed network ties from all-embracing solidary communities to more narrowly based ones: (a) cheap, effective transportation and communication facilities; (b) the separation of workplace and kinship ties into nonlocal, nonsolidary networks; (c) high rates of social and residential mobility (e.g., Crump, 1977).

The liberated argument, like the other two arguments, begins with the concept of space. Yet where the other arguments see communities as resident in neighborhoods, the liberated argument confronts spatial restrictions only in order to transcend them. Although harkening back to some of the more optimistic writings of Simmel about the liberating effect of urban life (e.g., 1902-1903: last portion; 1908: 121) and Park (e.g., 1925b: 65 ff.), the argument has become prominent only in the past two decades following the proliferation of personal automotive and airplane travel and telecommunications in the Western world. It contends that there is now the possibility of "community without propinquity" (Webber, 1964) in which distance and travel time are minimal constraints (e.g., Hiltz and Turoff, forthcoming).

LIBERATED NETWORKS

With its emphasis on aspatial communities, the liberated argument has been methodologically associated with network analytic techniques (e.g., Kadushin, 1966; Walker, 1977; Wellman, 1979). However, it must be emphasized that network analysis does not necessarily share the liberated argument's ideological bias and can be used to evaluate the existence of *all three* community patterns: lost, saved, and liberated.

In network terms, the liberated argument contends that:

(a) Urbanites now tend to be *limited members* of *several social networks,* possibly including one located in their neighborhood.
(b) There is *variation in the breadth of the strands* of relationships between network members; there are multistranded ties with some, single-stranded ties with many others, and relationships of intermediate breadth with the rest.
(c) The ties range in intensity: *some* of them are *strong,* while others are weak but nonetheless useful.
(d) An individual's ties tend to be organized into a *series of networks with few connections* between them.
(e) Networks tend to be *sparsely knit* although certain portions of the networks, such as those based on kinship, may be more densely knit.
(f) The networks are *loosely bounded, ramifying* structures, branching out extensively to form linkages to additional people and resources.
(g) Sparse density, loose boundaries, and narrowly defined ties provide *little structural basis for solidary activities and sentiments* in the overall networks of urbanites, although some solidary clusters of ties are often present.
(h) *Some network ties can be mobilized* for general-purpose or specific assistance in dealing with routine or emergency matters. The likelihood of mobilization depends more on the quality of the two-person tie than on the nature of the larger network structure.

IMAGERY

The liberated argument is fundamentally optimistic about urban life. It is appreciative of urban diversity; imputations of social disorganization and pathology find little place within it. The argument's view of human behavior emphasizes its entrepreneurial and manipulative aspects. People are seen as having a propensity to form primary ties, not out of inherent good or evil, but in order to accomplish specific, utilitarian ends.

The liberated argument, as does the lost argument, minimizes the importance of neighborhood communities. But where the lost argument sees this as throwing the urbanite upon the resources of formal organizations, the liberated argument contends that

sufficient primary ties are available in nonneighborhood networks to provide crucial social support and sociability. Furthermore, it argues that the diverse links between these networks organize the city as a "network of networks" (Craven and Wellman, 1973) to provide a flexible coordinating structure not possible through a lost formal, bureaucratic hierarchy or a saved agglomeration of neighborhoods.

The liberated argument recoils from the lost and saved arguments' village-like community norm. The argument celebrates the structural autonomy of being able to move among various social networks (e.g., Cox, 1966; Burt, 1976). It perceives solidary communities as fostering stifling social control and of causing isolation from outside contact and resources. Multiple social networks are valued because the cross-cutting commitments and alternative escape routes limit the claims that any one community can make upon its members.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Liberated analysts have called for the reinforcement of other social networks in addition to the traditional ones of the neighborhood and the family. Whereas industrial power considerations have worked against the development of solidary networks in the workplace, much attention has been paid recently to fostering "helping networks" that would prevent or heal the stress of physical and mental diseases (e.g., Caplan and Killilea, 1976; Hirsch, 1977; Ratcliffe, 1978). No longer is the neighborhood community seen as the safe, supportive haven; no longer are formal institutions to be relied on for all healing attempts. Instead, networks are to be mobilized, and where they do not exist they can be constructed so that urbanites may find supportive places. However, the efficacy of such deliberately constructed "natural support systems" (to use current jargon) has not yet been adequately demonstrated.

The liberated argument has had an important impact on thinking about political phenomena, especially that related to collective disorders. Research by Charles Tilly (e.g., 1975, 1978) and associates, in particular, has shown such collective disorders to be integral parts of broader contentions for power

by competing interest groups. In addition to the internal solidarity emphasized by the saved argument, a contending group's chances for success have been shown to be strongly associated with the capacity for making linkages in external coalitions that crosscutting ties between networks can provide (e.g., Gans, 1974a, 1974b; Granovetter, 1974b).

Recent British New Town planning (e.g., Milton Keynes) has been predicated on the high rates of personal automotive mobility foreseen by the liberated argument. However, the argument's contention that there are minimal costs to spatial separation has come up against the increase in the monetary costs of such separation associated with the significant rise in the price of oil within the last decade. One response has been to advocate increased reliance on telecommunications to maintain community ties over large distances. New developments in computer technology foreshadow major increases in telecommunications capabilities, such as "electronic mail" and "computer conferencing" (see Hiltz and Turoff, forthcoming). Yet the strength of the liberated argument does not necessarily depend on technological innovations. Recent research in preindustrial social systems has indicated that long-distance ties can be maintained without benefit of telephone or private automobiles, as long as such ties are structurally embedded in kinships systems or common local origins (e.g., Belshaw, 1965; Cohen, 1969; Laslett, 1971; Jacobson, 1973; Howard, 1974; Mayer and Mayer, 1974; Ross and Weisner, 1977; Bender, 1978).

CURRENT STATUS

Contemporary studies making the liberated argument have proliferated in the past decade. They have examined the nature of membership in multiple social networks (e.g., Kadushin, 1966; Laumann, 1973; Boissevain, 1974; Breiger, 1976; Bell and Newby, 1976; Shulman, 1976), the use of network ties to obtain needed resources (e.g., Cohen, 1969; Lee, 1969; Granovetter, 1974a; Jacobson, 1975), and the ways in which links between social networks can structure social systems (e.g., Granovetter, 1973; Wireman, 1978; Laumann, Galaskiewicz, and Marsden, forthcoming).

The strength of the liberated argument is that it can account for, and at the same time propose, socially close communities which stretch over large distances. "Community" need no longer necessarily be tied to "neighborhood." However, in propounding the virtues of nonlocal communities the liberated argument may have unduly neglected the usefulness of quick local accessibility and the advantages of the solidary behavior that can come with densely knit, tightly bounded, multistranded ties. To assert that one should not set out initially to search for solidarities, as the network perspective does, may be quite a different matter than the liberated argument's assertion of the nonexistence of such solidarities.

COMMUNITIES: LOST, SAVED, OR LIBERATED?

Are communities lost, saved, or liberated? Too often, the three arguments have been presented as (a) competing alternative depictions of the "true" nature of Western industrial bureaucratic social systems, or (b) evolutionary successors, with preindustrial saved communities giving way to industrial lost, only to be superseded by postindustrial liberated.

In contrast, we believe that all three arguments have validity when stripped of their ideological paraphernalia down to basic network structures.[4] Indeed their structural character might be highlighted by thinking of them as sparse, dense, and ramified network patterns. Different network patterns tend to have different consequences for the acquisition and control of resources (see the discussion of kinship systems in Wolf, 1966). We might then expect to find the prevalence of lost, saved, and liberated communities to vary according to the kinds of societal circumstances in which they are located.

SAVED COMMUNITIES/DENSE NETWORKS

In saved networks, densely knit ties and tight boundaries tend to occur together. This may be because network members have a finite lump of sociability, so that if they devote most of their energies to within-network ties, they do not have much scope

for maintaining external linkages. Conversely, tight boundaries may also foster the creation of new ties within the community, as internal links become the individual's principal hope of gaining access to resources.

Such dense, bounded saved networks, be they neighborhood, kinship, or otherwise based, are apt to be solidary in sentiments and activities. They are well-structured for maintaining informal social control over members and intruders. The dense ties and communal solidarity should facilitate the ready mobilization of the community's resources for the aid of members in good standing. But because solidarity does not necessarily mean egalitarianism, not all of the community's resources may be gathered or distributed equally.

Community studies have shown the saved pattern to be quite prevalent in situations in which community members do not have many individual personal resources and where there are unfavorable conditions for forming external ties. Certain ethnic minority and working-class neighborhoods clearly follow this pattern (e.g., Liebow, 1967). In such situations, concerns about conserving, controlling and efficiently pooling those resources the beleaguered community possesses also resonate with its members' inability to acquire additional resources elsewhere. A heavy load consequently is placed on ties within the saved community.

LIBERATED COMMUNITIES/RAMIFIED NETWORKS

If saved network patterns are particularly suited to conditions of resource scarcity and conservation, liberated network patterns are particularly suited to conditions of resource abundance and acquisition. Such sparsely knit, loosely bounded networks are not structurally well-equipped for internal social control. Implicit assurance in the security of one's home base is necessary before one can reach out into new areas.

Loose boundaries and sparse density foster networks that extensively branch out to link up with new members. These ramifying liberated networks are well-structured for acquiring additional resources through a larger number of direct and indirect external connections. Their structure is apt to connect

liberated network members with a more diverse array of resources than saved networks are apt to encounter, although the relative lack of solidarity in such liberated networks may well mean that a lower proportion of resources will be available to other network members.

It may well be that the liberated pattern is peculiarly suited to affluent sectors of contemporary Western societies. It places a premium on a base of individual security, entrepreneurial skills in moving between networks, and the ability to function without the security of membership in a solidary community. However, its appearance in other social contexts indicates that it reflects a more fundamental alternative to the saved community pattern.

Both the saved or liberated community patterns can appear as desirable alternatives to those enmeshed in the other pattern. To those unsatisfied with the uncertain multiplicities of liberated networks, holistic, solidary saved communities can appear as a welcome retreat. To those who feel trapped in all-embracing saved networks, the availability of alternative liberated primary networks may offer a welcome escape route. Much migration from rural areas may follow this tendency.

LOST COMMUNITIES/SPARSE NETWORKS

What of circumstances where no alternative network sources of escape or retreat are possible? It is in such situations that the lost pattern of direct affiliation with formal institutions can become attractive: the army, the church, the firm, and the university (see Shorter, 1973). However, the lost pattern may always be unstable for individuals and communities as formal institutional ties devolve into complex primary network webs. Therefore, as primary ties develop between the within organizations, we may expect to find networks taking on the patterns of saved or liberated communities.

PERSONAL COMMUNITIES

When studying neighborhoods and communities, we are likely to find diversity rather than a universal pattern to either local

or personal networks. We have proposed that dense saved network patterns are better suited for internal control of resources while ramified liberated patterns are better suited for obtaining access to external resources. Although we have suggested that each of these patterns should be more prevalent in one sort of a society than another, it is quite likely that the total network of a community will comprise a mixture of these two patterns in varying proportions. That is, some of the ties within a network will be densely knit and tightly bounded, while others will be sparsely knit and ramified. The different patterns are useful for different things. As Merton (1957) early pointed out, most communities have some network members for exchanging resources with the outside world ("cosmopolitans") and some for allocating them internally ("locals").

Our own research in the Borough of East York, Toronto, has revealed that individuals, too, may be simultaneous members of both saved and liberated pattern networks.[5] Some of an urbanite's ties tend to be clustered into densely knit, tightly bounded networks, their solidarity often reinforced by either kinship structures or residential or work-place propinquity. Such saved networks are better able to mobilize help in emergencies through efficient communication and structurally enforced norms. Their density and boundedness tend to give these clusters more of a tangible collective image, so that network members have a sense of solidary attachment.

Yet we have found (Wellman, 1979) that such clusters are likely to comprise only a minority of one's important network ties. The other ties tend to be much less densely connected. Instead of looping back into one another within boundaries, they tend to be ramified, branching out to encounter new members to whom the original network members are not directly connected. These sparsely knit, loosely bounded liberated networks are structurally not as efficient in mobilizing collective assistance for their members, but their branching character allows additional resources to be reached. Furthermore, the liberated ties, while not as conducive to internal solidarity as the saved clusters, better facilitate coalition building between networks.

NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY

Almost all of the people we studied have many strong ties and they are able to obtain assistance through a number of close relationships. Yet only a small proportion of these "intimate" ties are located in the same neighborhood (Wellman, 1979). While neighboring ties are still prevalent and important in East York, they rarely achieve the intensity of intimacy (see Gates, Stevens, and Wellman, 1973).

Neighborhood relationships persist but only as specialized components of the overall primary networks. The variety of ties in which an urbanite can be involved—with distant parents, intimate friends, less intimate friends, coworkers, and so on—and the variety of networks in which these are organized can provide flexible structural bases for dealing with routine and emergency matters.

In sum, we must be concerned with neighborhood *and* community rather than neighborhood *or* community. We have suggested that the two are separate concepts which may or may not be closely associated. In some situations we can observe the saved pattern of community as solidary neighborhood. In many other situations, if we go out and look for neighborhood-based networks, we are apt to find them. They can be heavily used for the advantages of quick accessibility. But if we broaden our field of view to include other primary relations, then the apparent neighborhood solidarities may now be seen as clusters in the rather sparse, loosely bounded structures of urbanites' total networks.

NOTES

1. Network analysis is essentially a perspective which focuses on structured relationships between individuals and collectivities. As yet there is no commonly agreed definition. We believe that network analysis's salient characteristics are that it gives attention to: (a) structured patterns of relationships and not the aggregated characteristics of individual units, analyzed without reference to their interrelationships; (b) complex network structures and not just dyadic ties; (c) the allocation of scarce resources through concrete systems of power, dependency, and coordination; (d) questions of network boundaries, clusters and cross-linkages; (e) structures of reciprocal relationships and not just simple hierarchies. For summaries of the network perspective, see White (1965);

Mitchell (1969, 1974); Barnes (1972); White, Boorman and Breiger (1976). See also the bibliographies of Wellman and Whitaker (1974); Freeman (1976); Klovdahl (1977).

2. One mental health technique, questionably labeled "network therapy," has as a principal goal the "retribalization" of those with whom the patient is in close contact (see Speck and Attneave, 1973).

3. Perhaps only Banfield (1958) and Vidich and Bensman (1958) have set forth in search of solidary communities and not found them.

4. Our review of the saved literature has already indicated the abundant evidence for the presence of densely knit, tightly bounded communities in contemporary Western social systems (e.g., Whyte, 1955; Young and Willmott, 1957; Gans, 1962; Liebow, 1967). While only Bender (1978) has explicitly attempted to argue the prevalence of liberated patterns in preindustrial social systems, historians have begun reporting nonsolidary aspects of preindustrial Western Europe (e.g., Laslett, 1971; Scott and Tilly, 1975; Shorter, 1975; Tilly, 1975). We can look to studies of peer groups, interest groups, travel out of the local area, and complex households (masters, servants, laborers; multiple generations, with nonlocal marriages) having a variety of external ties as providing some basis for the existence of liberated patterns. The prevalence of long-distance, liberated ties in contemporary non-Western social systems has been more extensively documented (see review of the liberated literature).

5. The data collected in 1968 random-sample, closed-ended survey of 845 adult East Yorkers, directed by Donald B. Coates, with Barry Wellman as coordinator. East York (1971 population = 104,646) is an upper working-class, lower middle-class, predominantly British-Canadian inner-city suburb of Toronto. It has the reputation of being one of the most solidary areas of the city. Respondents were asked about "persons outside your home who you feel closest to" up to a maximum of six. See Wayne (1971), Shulman (1972, 1976), Crump (1977), Wellman (1979), and Wellman, Shulman, Wayne, and Crump (forthcoming) for the findings.

REFERENCES

BANFIELD, E. (1968) The Unheavenly City. Boston: Little, Brown.

——— (1958) The Moral Basis of a Backward Society. New York: Free Press.

BARNES, J. A. (1972) Social Networks. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

BELL, C. and H. NEWBY (1976) "Community, communion, class and community action," pp. 189-207 in D. T. Herbert and R. J. Johnson (eds.) Social Areas in Cities II: Spatial Perspectives on Problems and Policies. London: John Wiley.

BELSHAW, C. (1965) Traditional Exchange and Modern Markets. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

BENDER, T. (1978) Community and Social Change in America. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press.

BOISSEVAIN, J. (1974) Friends of Friends. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

BREIGER, R. L. (1976) "Career attributes and network structure: a blockmodel study of a biomedical research specialty." Amer. Soc. Rev. 41 (February): 117-135.

BRETON, R. (1964) "Institutional completeness of communities and the personal relations of immigrants." Amer. J. of Sociology 70 (September): 193-205.

BURT, R. (1976) "Autonomy in a social topology." Unpublished paper. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, Univ. of Chicago.

CAPLAN, G. and M. KILLILEA (1976) Suipport Systems and Mutual Aid. New York: Grune & Stratton.
CASTELLS, M. (1976) The Urban Question. London: Edward Arnold.
CLAIRMONT, D. and D. MAGILL (1974) Africville. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
COHEN, A. (1969) Custom and Politics in Urban Africa. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
COX, H. (1966) The Secular City. New York: Macmillan.
CRAVEN, P. and B. WELLMAN (1973) "The network city." Soc. Inquiry 43 (December): 57-88.
CRUMP, B. (1977) "The portability of urban ties." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, September, Chicago.
"Death Wish" (1974) Directed and Coproduced by Michael Winner. Written by Wendell Mayes. Produced by Hal Landers and Bobby Roberts. Starring Charles Bronson. A Dino DeLaurentis Production. From the novel by Brian Garfield.
DURKHEIM, E. (1893, 1933) The Division of Labor in Society. New York: Macmillan.
ENGELS, F. (1845, 1969) The Condition of the Working Class in England. St. Albans, Herts.: Panther Books.
FEAGIN, J.R. (1973) "Community disorganization: some critical notes." Soc. Inquiry 43 (December): 123-146.
——— and H. HAHN (1973) Ghetto Revolt: The Politics of Violence in American Cities. New York: Macmillan.
FISCHER, C. S. (1976) The Urban Experience. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
FREEMAN, L. C. (1976) A Bibliography of Social Networks. Monticello, IL: Council of Planning Librarians, Exchange Bibliographies Nos. 1170-1171.
GANS, H. J. (1974a) "Gans on Granovetter's 'Strength of Weak Ties.'" Amer. J. of Sociology 80 (September): 524-527.
——— (1974b) "Gans' response to Granovetter." Amer. J. of Sociology 80 (September): 529-531.
——— (1967) The Levittowners. New York: Pantheon.
——— (1962) The Urban Villagers. New York: Free Press.
GATES, A. S., H. STEVENS, and B. WELLMAN (1973) "What makes a good neighbour?" Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, August, New York.
GRANOVETTER, M. (1974a) Getting a Job. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
——— (1974b) "Granovetter replies to Gans." Amer. J. of Sociology 80 (September): 527-529.
——— (1973) "The strength of weak ties." Amer. J. of Sociology 78 (May): 1360-1380.
GRANT, G. (1969) "In defence of North America," pp. 15-40 in Technology and Empire. Toronto: Anansi.
GREER, S. (1962) The Emerging City. New York: Free Press.
GUSFIELD, J. R. (1975) Community: A Critical Response. New York: Harper & Row.
HILLERY, G. A., Jr. (1955) "Definitions of community: areas of agreement." Rural Sociology 20 (June): 111-123.
HILTZ, R. S. and M. TUROFF (forthcoming) The Network Nation: Human Communication via Computer. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
HIRSCH, B. (1977) "The social network as a natural support system." Paper read at the Annual Meetings of the American Psychological Association, August, San Francisco.
HOWARD, L. (1974) "Industrialization and community in Chotanagpur." Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ.

HUNTER, A. (1975) "The loss of community: an empirical test through replication." Amer. Soc. Rev. 40 (October): 537-552.

——— and G. SUTTLES (1972) "The expanding community of limited liability," pp. 44-81 in G. Suttles (ed.) The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

JACOBS, J. (1961) The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Random House.

JACOBSON, D. (1975) "Fair-weather friend: label and context in middle-class friendships." J. of Anthropological Research 31 (Autumn): 225-234.

——— (1973) Itinerant Townsmen: Friendship and Social Order in Urban Uganda. Menlo Park, CA: Cummings.

JANOWITZ, M. (1952) The Community Press in an Urban Setting. New York: Free Press.

KADUSHIN, C. (1966) "The friends and supporters of psychotherapy: on social circles in urban life." Amer. Soc. Rev. 31 (December): 786-802.

KASARDA, J. D. and M. JANOWITZ (1974) "Community attachment in mass society." Amer. Soc. Rev. 39 (June): 328-339.

KELLER, S. (1968) The Urban Neighborhood. New York: Random House.

KLOVDAHL, A. S. (1977) "Social networks: selected references for course design and research planning." Mimeographed. Canberra: Department of Sociology, Australian National University.

KORNHAUSER, W. (1959) The Politics of Mass Society. New York: Free Press.

LASCH, C. (1977) Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged. New York: Basic Books.

LASLETT, P. (1971) The World We Have Lost. London: Methuen.

LAUMANN, E. O. (1973) Bonds of Pluralism. New York: John Wiley.

———, J. GALASKIEWICZ, and P. MARSDEN (forthcoming) "Community structures as interorganizational linkages." Annual Rev. of Sociology.

LEE, N. H. (1969) The Search for an Abortionist. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

LIEBOW, E. (1967) Tally's Corner. Boston: Little, Brown.

MARX, L. (1964) The Machine in the Garden. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

MAYER, P. and I. MAYER (1974) Townsmen or Tribesmen. Capetown: Oxford Univ. Press.

MELLOR, J. R. (1977) Urban Sociology in an Urbanized Society. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

MERTON, R. K. (1957) "Patterns of influence: local and cosmopolitan influentials," pp. 387-420 in Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

MITCHELL, J. C. (1974) "Social networks." Annual Rev. of Anthropology 3: 279-299.

——— (1969) "The concept and use of social networks," pp. 1-50 in J. C. Mitchell (ed.) Social Networks in Urban Situations. Manchester: Univ. of Manchester Press.

NEWMAN, O. (1972) Defensible Space. New York: Macmillan.

NISBET, R. (1962) Community and Power. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

PARK, R. E. (1936) "Human ecology." Amer. J. of Sociology 42 (July): 1-15.

——— (1925a) "The city: suggestions for the investigation of human behavior in the urban environment," pp. 1-46 in R. E. Park, E. W. Burgess, and R. D. McKenzie (eds.) The City. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

——— (1925b) "The urban community as a spatial pattern and a moral order," pp. 55-68 in R. H. Turner (ed.) Robert E. Park on Social Control and Collective Behavior. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

POPENOE, D. (1977) The Suburban Environment. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

POWELL, A. [ed.] (1972) The City: Attacking Modern Myths. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
RATCLIFFE, W. (1978) "Social networks and health." Connections 1 (Summer): 25-37.
ROSS, M. H. and T. S. WEISNER (1977) "The rural-urban migrant network in Kenya." Amer. Ethnologist 4 (May): 359-375.
SCOTT, J. and L. TILLY (1975) "Women's work and the family in nineteenth century Europe." Comparative Studies in Society and History 17 (January): 36-64.
SENNETT, R. (1970) Families Against the City. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
SHORTER, E. (1975) The Making of the Modern Family. New York: Basic Books.
——— (1973) "Female emancipation, birth control, and fertility in European history." Amer. Hist. Rev. 78 (June): 605-640.
SHULMAN, N. (1976) "Network analysis: a new addition to an old bag of tricks." Acta Sociologica 19 (March): 307-323.
——— (1972) "Urban social networks." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Univ. of Toronto.
SIMMEL, G. (1908, 1971) "Group expansion and the development of individuality," pp. 251-293 in D. N. Levine (ed.) Georg Simmel: On Individuality and Social Forms. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
——— (1902-1903, 1950) "The metropolis and mental life," pp. 409-424 in K. Wolff (ed.) The Sociology of Georg Simmel. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
SLATER, P. E. (1970) The Pursuit of Loneliness. Boston: Beacon.
SPECK, R. V. and C. ATTNEAVE (1973) Family Networks. New York: Pantheon.
STEIN, N. (1960) The Eclipse of Community. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
SUTTLES, G. D. (1972) The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
TILLY, C. (1978) From Mobilization to Revolution. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
——— (1975) "Food supply and public order in Modern Europe," pp. 380-455 in C. Tilly (ed.) The Formation of National States in Western Europe. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
——— (1974) "Introduction," pp. 1-35 in C. Tilly (ed.) An Urban World. Boston: Little, Brown.
——— (1973) "Do communities act?" Soc. Inquiry 43 (December): 209-240.
TONNIES, F. (1887, 1955) Community and Association. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
VIDICH, A. J. and J. BENSMAN (1958) Small Town in Mass Society. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
WALKER, G. (1977) "Social networks and territory in a commuter village, Bond Head, Ontario." Canadian Geographer 21 (Winter): 329-350.
WARREN, D. I. and R. B. WARREN (1976) "The helping role of neighbors: some empirical findings." Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, Oakland Univ. December.
WARREN, R. (1978) The Community in America. Chicago: Rand McNally.
WAYNE, J. (1971) "Networks of informal participation in a suburban context." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Univ. of Toronto.
WEBBER, M. (1964) "The urban place and the nonplace urban realm," in M. Webber et al. (eds.) Exploration into Urban Structure. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.
——— (1963) "Order in diversity: community without propinquity," pp. 23-54 in L. Wingo, Jr. (ed.) Cities and Space: The Future Use of Urban Land. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

WELLMAN, B. (1979) "The community question." Amer. J. of Sociology (forthcoming).
———, N. SHULMAN, J. WAYNE, and B. CRUMP (forthcoming) Personal Communities in the City. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
WELLMAN, B. and M. WHITAKER (1974) Community—Network—Communication: An Annotated Bibliography. Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, Bibliographic Paper No. 4, Univ. of Toronto.
WHITE, H. (1965) "Notes on the constituents of social structure." Cambridge, MA: Department of Social Relations, Harvard Univ. (mimeographed).
WHITE, H. C., S. A. BOORMAN, and R. L. BREIGER (1976) "Social structure from multiple networks I: blockmodels of roles and positions." Amer. J. of Sociology 81 (January): 730-780.
WHITE, M. and L. WHITE (1962) The Intellectual Versus the City. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
WHYTE, W. F. (1955) Street Corner Society. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
WIREMAN, P. (1978) "Intimate secondary relations." Paper presented at the Ninth World Congress of Sociology, August, Uppsala, Sweden.
WIRTH, L. (1938) "Urbanism as a way of life." Amer. J. of Sociology 44 (July): 3-24.
WOLF, E. R. (1966) "Kinship, friendship, and patron-client relations in complex societies," pp. 1-22 in M. Banton (ed.) The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies. London: Tavistock.
WOODSWORTH, J. S. (1911, 1972) My Neighbour. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.
YOUNG, M. and P. WILLMOTT (1957) Family and Kinship in East London. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Barry Wellman is Associate Professor of Sociology and a member of the Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto. He is Coordinator of the International Network for Social Network Analysis and Editor of Connections, *its informal journal. His other works on urban networks include* The Network City *(with Paul Craven) and* The Community Question. *He is currently preparing a monograph on research into the structure and use of social networks in Toronto with Norman Shulman, Jack Wayne, and Barry Crump.*

Barry Leighton (formerly Barry Crump) is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Sociology and is a member of the Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto. He is Associate Editor of Connections. *His other work on urban networks includes* The Portability of Urban Ties. *His current research is investigating the impact of residential mobility on urban social networks.*