
In 1683, ten months after his arrival in America, William Penn wrote this brief sketch of the Delaware Indians; it was quickly printed and a number of European editions appeared. In 1937 Albert Cook Myers, the well known historian of Pennsylvania Quakerism, published an edition based on a collation of the published versions and the original manuscript held by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Along with Penn's own account, which occupies twenty-one small pages, are here printed various other occasional writings of Penn on the subject of Indians and provincial relations with them, and the texts of a few of the early treaties. The present edition is a reprinting of the Albert Cook Myers' edition with a brief foreword by John E. Pomfret.

Penn's account attends principally to what might be called the personal and domestic habits of the Delawares; their customs of toiletry, their child-rearing practices, food and cooking, language, menstrual taboos, and so on. There is an indication of matrilineal descent, a sketching of the Green Corn Ceremony, and a description of the procedure of the Indians in councils with whites. Although Penn claimed to "have made it my business to understand" the language well enough to do without an interpreter, it is unlikely that he had time in ten months to acquire a high enough degree of fluency to inquire into subtle questions. Thus in matters of social organization the account is more tantalizing than satisfying; his constant allusion to Indian "Kings," for instance, makes one wonder what political role the individuals so designated actually played, for "Kings" in the European sense these people did not have.

This early account of Penn's is more valuable to the anthropologist in enabling him to classify the Delaware Indians on the basis of various traits than in providing an analysis of their culture. The historian who wishes the latter should turn to later works by Harrington, Speck, Newcomb, and others who have had the opportunity to collate the observations of many people (including their own) into a full portrait.

University of Pennsylvania

ANTHONY F. C. WALLACE

The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. Volume 14 (January 1, 1767-December 31, 1767). Leonard W. Labaree, Editor; Helen C. Boatfield and James
In August 1767, William Franklin related to his father a recent conversation with Joseph Galloway. After showing Galloway a portion of a journal sent by the elder Franklin to his son, William noted Galloway’s astonishment at Benjamin Franklin’s ability “to go through so much Business, and yet write so much.” Surely any reviewer called upon to peruse a volume from this magnificently mounted collection will echo Galloway’s judgment. The extent of Franklin’s correspondence is even more striking as one reads repeatedly among the footnotes of the number of letters which the editors regret they have been unable to locate.

Two major impressions are evident from this particular set of papers. The first involved an increasing disenchantment within English political circles toward the American colonies. This attitude was manifested in the passage of the program of taxation proposed by Charles Townshend. The Townshend Duty Act reversed the parliamentary policy incorporated in the repeal of the Stamp Act. Franklin’s views toward Townshend’s program displayed a certain fatalism which the generally optimistic Pennsylvanian rarely manifested. Part of this intransigent mood toward the colonial viewpoint was a stigma attached to those sympathetic to the American cause. In an August letter to Galloway describing an abortive attempt to form a new ministry, Franklin declared his pleasure at this failure “as some of those who were propos’d to be introduc’d, are professed Adversaries to America, which is now made one of the Distinctions of Party here; those who in the two last Sessions have shown a disposition to favour us, being called by Way of Reproach Americans.”

Secondly, an unstated change appeared in Franklin’s realization of his own importance as a spokesman for American interests. Despite a constant flow of information from his Pennsylvania political allies, Franklin’s interest in his former political bailiwick seemed to wane. Following his famous testimony concerning the Stamp Act, Franklin interpreted his role as Pennsylvania’s agent as transcending any one colony’s particular interests. This realization is evident in an important letter to the Scottish jurist Lord Kames in which Franklin ably stated his views on constitutional issues facing the British world. In addition, Franklin wrote of his own dual loyalties to crown and colony, displaying a fatalism which augured a possibly unavoidable clash. Franklin’s view must have represented the feelings of many British-Americans.

America, an immense Territory, favour’d by Nature ... must become a great country, ... and will ... be able to shake off any Shackles that may be impos’d on her, and perhaps place them on the Imposers. In the mean time, every Act of Oppression will sour their Tempers, ... and hasten their final Revolt: For the Seeds of Liberty are universally sown there, and nothing can eradicate them. And yet there remains among that People so much Respect, Veneration and Affection for Britain, that, if cultivated prudently, ... they might be easily govern’d still for Ages, without Force or any considerable Expense. But I do not
see here a sufficient Quantity of the Wisdom that is necessary to produce such a Conduct, and I lament the Want of it.

Franklin's worldliness increased with his first trip to France in September. He realized the political potency of American contacts in France, commenting on French hopes to "blow up the coals between Britain and her colonies." Perhaps he recalled these words as a peacemaker in Paris sixteen years later. Franklin's description of the sojourn is testimony to his sharp wit and keen eye. The channel crossing included some passengers never before at sea who had helped themselves to a large breakfast. "Doubtless they thought . . . that when they had swallowed it, they were sure of it. But . . . the Sea laid Claim to it and they were oblig'd to give it up." Franklin's strongest impressions of France were of the people, especially "French Politeness" to strangers. Such consideration of visitors raised Franklin's English loyalties; "Why don't we practice this Urbanity to Frenchmen? Why should they be allowed to out-do us in any thing?" Nevertheless, Franklin's beloved England triumphed. "There is, in short, both at Versailles and Paris, a prodigious Mixture of Magnificence and Negligence, with every kind of Elegance except that of Cleanliness, and what we call Tidyness."

Another dimension of the man was his role as transatlantic father looking on from afar as Sally Franklin married Richard Bache, a man her father had not met. Initially, Franklin saw little problem with the match, trusting the judgment of his wife in Philadelphia. However, soon after the couple met Bache's financial position became very shaky, prompting William Franklin to warn his father that Bache was a "mere Fortune Hunter" desirous of marrying into a "Family that will support him." Bache wrote Franklin of his feelings for Sally and his personal misfortune. Franklin's fatherly reply urged caution upon the couple. He noted his inability to support them, cautioning Bache not to proceed until he could care for Sally in a proper fashion. "I hope you will not persist in the proceeding that may be attended with ruinous consequences to you both." As children have a want to do, they disregarded the elder Franklin's advice and were married. No response to this rebuff came from father.

Finally, this volume represents the completion after fifteen years of the editorial involvement of Professor Labaree and Miss Boatfield. They have established a mark of editorial excellence for all to achieve. Scholars will be forever grateful for their efforts.

California State College, Long Beach

DAVID BERNSTEIN


"Sounds like a box of candy," was the retort of a colleague upon hearing the title of Paul B. Beers' The Pennsylvania Sampler. Unfortunately the analogy seems all too apt as The Sampler uses pre-packaged journalese to make some thinly-sliced selections from reputable authors barely palatable. Topically organized by selected excerpts into People and Places, In-
industry, Politics, Success Stories, and Pennsylvania in Literature, The Sampler "does not attempt to provide a broad, all encompassing theory, a one-clue and one answer concept to explain 300 years of history and a multiplicity of people and cultures." Instead, purporting "to rectify the widespread lack of recognition of the state's considerable accomplishments," Beers, both as narrator and compiler, seeks to permit a "multitude of voices" to speak about Pennsylvania and Pennsylvanians. Some of the authors and selections are indeed impressive and enlightening, ranging from Charles Dickens' "The Harrisburg Mail," and Stephen Crane's "In the Depths of a Coal Mine," to S. K. Stevens' "A Shot is Heard in Pennsylvania," and Gifford Pinchot's "Time Like an Ever-Rolling Stream."

Twenty-one brief or excerpted selections, however, do not a multitude make, particularly so when four of the passages are by Beers, himself. This, and the brevity of most selections, an average five pages, hardly permits the other voices to rise above a murmur. One naturally understands that Beers faced obvious reprint limitations in the choice and published use of the various articles. However, the merits or deficiencies of any sampler lie not so much with the sampled material as they do with the compiler who must select, adapt, or narrate the diverse viewpoints to serve his stated purpose without thrusting himself or his prejudices before the reader.

If Beers has any prejudice, it is for his native state. An award-winning journalist with the Harrisburg Patriot-News, Beers' journalistic spirit and voiced love for Pennsylvania pervade the entire work, often muffling the very voices he wishes to give hearing. His table of contents, for example, much like a box of candy, points out the delights to be sampled within. "Theodore Dreiser's A Hoosier Holiday reveals his strong reactions to the cities of the state . . . the reasons make fascinating reading." The only Dreiser one finds within is in three quoted passages in Beers' introduction to his own article "The American Tragedies," an account of the Harvey Lake murders in 1934 which Dreiser covered on assignment for the New York Post.

In fairness, however, Beers is not always misleading in expressing the quality of particular samples. That "no one is better qualified to write about Pennsylvania's significant role in the American Revolution than Dr. S. K. Stevens" cannot be argued. But even this selection is "abridged and adapted," denying the reader an unfiltered hearing of one of Pennsylvania's ablest spokesmen. Suffice to say also that the inclusion of former newspaper features such as Joseph Lowry on O'Hara's Gibbsville, James Welsh on Nixon's family tree, and Sanford Starobin on K. Leroy Irvis, first black majority leader of the Pennsylvania House, coupled with Beers' own narration and articles from his "Reporter-at-large" columns in the Patriot-News, give a strongly journalistic voice and viewpoint to much of The Sampler.

Two unique features of The Sampler are its unusual index and its listing of a Pennsylvania "400," the state's best talent in various fields of endeavor. The index is placed following front matter and is titled "The
Pennsylvania Pageant,” one section indexing people, from Walter Alessandri to Efrem Zimbalist, Sr., and the other, places from Abington to York County. Both lists seem contrived. The majority of the people and one-half of the places named are not discussed in the text to any large degree, since the only place they are even mentioned is in Beers’ listing of the “400” at the end of the book. Oddly, President Buchanan’s birthplace is not listed in the index of Pennsylvania places, and even when mentioned in the text it is cited as Stony Batter in Gove Gap rather than the correct Cove Gap. Thus faulty proofing or editorial oversight adds one more humiliation to the already abused image of the state’s only President. As for the Pennsylvania “400,” it is Beers’ own and “a game anyone can play.” One must agree “the list is actually Benjamin Franklin plus 399 others.”

Where The Pennsylvania Sampler stands in the genre of writings on Pennsylvania is difficult to say. On one hand, it is a needed sampler of varying literary and historical perspectives on the diverse facets of the state. Yet in many ways The Sampler is boxed in a narration of pure “boosterism” which overwhelms the best selections that are sensitive to the forces molding the cultural and political entity known as Pennsylvania. Perhaps, in the last analysis, The Pennsylvania Sampler is not a sampler at all, but one man’s enthusiastic testimony to his native state, his own voice loudest in singing its praise.

The Mercersburg Academy


Bucks is one of the three original counties of Pennsylvania, and its inhabitants have always preserved a due sense of tradition. The county historical society maintains a library and museum in Doylestown that are far above the average of such local institutions. A series of local historians have established a firm and generally dependable basis for modern scholarship. To an extraordinary degree, they have held to the principle of honesty in scholarship, regardless of the damage thus done to filiopiety. Bucks may be the only place in America where the local people have stubbornly insisted, against contrary views expressed by historians of national reputation, that their ancestors did swindle the Indians.

The serious reader cannot regard Mr. McNealy’s book as a substitute for or as an addition to its solidly researched predecessors. Even to suggest the comparison seems unfair. The “Historical-Tourist Commission” publisher obviously was more interested in tourists than in history. That the book was written to order is plain enough, and the order seems to have been for a combination of chronicle and gazetteer.

It hurries breathlessly through a multitude of things. Chapter 6 on “Colonial Life in Bucks County” is six pages long, which seems inexcusably scant considering the presence of the Mercer Museum. There are brief notices of the varied ethnic groups of early Bucks, and it is to
Mr. McNealy’s credit that he has not overlooked the Dutch, but the treatment is bland. The fierce struggles between Scotch-Irish Presbyterians and English Quakers for political domination and economic advantage are wholly passed by, as are also the perpetual disputes between the country party, so strong in Bucks, and the Proprietary party based on the placemen in Philadelphia. Blandness, indeed, is a keynote. Even scandal-ridden Durham Furnace is presented as just another curious enterprise of a placid bygone day.

The bibliography shows an odd mixture of available materials instead of sources searched out for their indispensability. For instance, some account inevitably is given of the Walking Purchase, which would be improved considerably by reference to A. F. C. Wallace’s King of the Delaware: Teedyuscung, 1700-1763. McNealy has been content, however, with William J. Buck’s History of the Indian Walk—an excellent book in its day, but its day was 1855.

There would be no point in cataloging what the book needs to establish a place in a permanent library. It is convenient enough for its seeming purpose—that of a manual to be used on casual trips through the tradition-rich and scenic countryside. It is a paperback with a fairly sturdy cover, it is cheap in price, and it will give some sense of meaning to the tourist. The historian wanting details of locality for scholarly purposes will do better with an older, more comprehensive volume: George MacReynolds, Place Names in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Alphabetically Arranged in an Historical Narrative (2d ed., Doylestown: Bucks County Historical Society, 1955).

Cedar Crest College

Francis Jennings


This volume contains three parts: unannotated reprinted editions of Nathan Appleton’s Introduction of the Power Loom and Origin of Lowell, first published in 1858, and the Introduction and Early Progress of the Cotton Manufacturer in the United States, authored by Samuel Batchelder in 1863; and George Rogers Taylor’s “Introduction to the J. & J. Harper Edition” written for this publication. The reprinted material offers students easy access to some of the most interesting published contemporary descriptions of the cotton textile industry. In addition to factual information, the books reveal the attitudes of two leading manufacturers as they reviewed the history of this industry near the ends of their long and successful careers.

Professor Taylor’s thirty-one page essay presents short biographical sketches of the two nineteenth century textile manufacturers who became historians, and he briefly describes their writings. Drawing upon his own life-long research in the economic history of the ante-Bellum era and the recent work of other scholars, Taylor also perceptibly analyses the important contributions of this industry to rapid national and regional eco-
onomic development between 1815 and 1860, and to the rise of urban industrial centers "with backward, forward, and lateral linkages." He suggests that the cotton textile industry prevented the economy of New England from decaying when agriculture and commerce fell during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Because of its scope and importance, this introduction should interest a wide variety of historians.

To support his statement that the cotton textile industry played "perhaps a leading role" in economic change, the author first reviews the expansion of foreign and domestic demands for textiles and the surge in the output of the northeastern factories. Taylor lucidly describes the series of evolutionary mechanical improvements which increased productivity; he clearly states that significant technological advances occurred in the three decades before the Civil War as well as during the early years of the century; and he indicates the continuing diffusion of technological know-how from both foreign and domestic sources which took place as manufacturers tried to improve their processes. In one of the most interesting sections the author draws attention to the significant development of power transmission by leather belting instead of cogs or gears, and the slow, yet certain adoption of turbines and steam engines as major sources of power for the textile mills.

While Professor Taylor emphasizes the importance of technological innovations, as do several of the other recent students of this industry, he also summarizes some of the key developments in business organization and management. He pays particular attention to the growth of the Waltham System. The author concludes his analysis with a sketch of the early beginnings of the Boston Associates, indicates their relationships to Appleton and Batchelder, and describes the domination of New England industry by this group of investors and promoters in the 1850's.

This reviewer does not know of any better brief analysis of the history and importance of the American cotton textile industry before 1860. The footnotes of the introductory essay reveal that Professor Taylor has drawn extensively and creatively upon both primary sources and recent scholarship. Historians should not overlook this deceptively modest volume.

University of West Florida

Lucius F. Ellsworth


Here is another military treatise centering on the celebrated battle at Gettysburg. Warren W. Hassler, Jr., whose previous books prove him a knowledgeable student of Civil War strategy and tactics, justifies this one on the ground that "the first day's battle at Gettysburg was quite as important and significant as the succeeding two day's combat." He may well be right despite the consensus of most who have previously analyzed the pivotal three-day engagement. The generally accepted verdict is that it was the repulse of Pickett's Charge on the third day that was the decisive turn of the contest. But we now have Professor Hassler's book to put
alongside George R. Stewart's *Pickett's Charge*. Perhaps some other hardy historian will soon provide a definitive and equally detailed book-length demonstration that it was the fighting in the Peach Orchard, Wheatfield, and on Little Round Top that saved Gettysburg for Meade and lost it for Lee.

While this reviewer cannot accept the Hassler thesis *in toto*, he grants that *Crisis at the Crossroads* goes far to put the first day's action in clearer perspective. Most accounts treat that sanguinary encounter as an accidental one which, along with the grim struggle of July 2nd, merely led up to the great dénouement at the Union center on the final day. This is misplaced emphasis, and the author marshals an impressive array of facts to make his point. Indeed, he sets forth almost too many facts. He begins one chapter with a statement which could apply to the entire book: "If the reader finishes this chapter with a feeling of confusion, he is experiencing only the true flavor and spirit of what actually was a maelstrom of desperate, uncoordinated happenings." Unfortunately, the general reader is forced to wade through a dry chronicle of minute-by-minute and yard-by-yard movements simultaneously taken by many regiments plus a catalog of their successive commanders. This does little to dispel whatever confusion is produced, and such treatment likely will interest few but the incorrigible "Gettysburg buffs."

Nevertheless, Dr. Hassler offers insights and interpretations which are useful. He directs attention to the new problems facing the Confederates who were forced to attack their enemy across open country in contrast to their previous advantage of remaining on the defense in the Virginia underbrush. He underscores the importance of the Federals' success in preventing the seizure of the heights of Cemetery Hill by their foes before Union reinforcements could arrive. For Johnny Reb and Bill Yank, he has little but praise. His defense of the troops of the much maligned Union Eleventh Corps is persuasive. The conflict on that July day, he declares, "demonstrates in a manner that is crystal clear the magnificent fighting qualities of both the Union and Confederate soldiers." He awards high marks to Doubleday and is critical of Howard. He finds A. P. Hill's action in bringing on a fight before Lee was ready for it to be "irresponsible." He does not criticize Ewell for the Confederate failure to attack Cemetery Hill late in the day. Indeed, he believes Lee "would have done better . . . to have given Ewell specific orders, instead of discretionary ones." He is mildly disapproving of Meade for that general's failure to come to the battlefield before the fight had ended.

In a book so full of details, minor errors inevitably appear. Hassler's have to do with distances. In one place he puts Manchester, Maryland, thirty miles from Gettysburg, and in another twenty-two miles. He is inaccurate as to the relative position of "McPherson's Grove" between the Hagerstown road and the Chambersburg pike, as he is of the distance between the latter and the unfinished railroad grading. There are some interesting omissions. The folklore which is a part of the Gettysburg story deals with those shoes which Hill's troops sought in the town and which
led to Heth's fateful advance of July 1st. The author makes no mention of the legendary shoes other than to quote Heth's question put to Hill the previous evening: "If there is no objection, I will take my division tomorrow and go to Gettysburg and get those shoes." Hill's laconic "None in the world," as Hassler writes, "touched off events that were to be momentous." It is upon such fictions as "shoes in Gettysburg" that great events often turn, the crisis at the crossroads being a fair example.

Dr. Hassler relies exclusively upon published works for his material, and this is acceptable. But one wonders why such a preponderance of "Yankee writers." In a narrative so full of stories of intense fighting on a regimental level, one would expect both sides to have "equal time." Yet, of the thirty-three regimental histories listed in the bibliography, only two are of Southern origin. As Crisis at the Crossroads makes clear, Southern survivors of the initial day at Gettysburg had every reason to be proud of their accomplishments and set them down in published form.

Gettysburg College

ROBERT L. BLOOM


Convinced that revisionist studies of the Reconstruction era must be extended "far beyond the customary framework which focuses attention upon the Presidency, Congress, and the South," Professor Richard O. Curry has brought together six short studies of "internal politics" during this period in the border states. These were Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Tennessee, and three essays on, respectively, the origins of Liberal Republicanism, the Freedmen's Bureau, and Federal enforcement of the right to vote in these same states. Tennessee, although not ordinarily categorized as a border state, is included because her re-admission to the Union in 1866 "created a political situation that conforms to border state patterns." The editor's introduction provides the general context, comments on some of the conclusions of the individual studies, and adds some independent judgments emerging from what he presents as an attempt at collective historical analysis.

In "Reconstruction Politics in Missouri, 1865-1870," William E. Parrish, drawing upon his two earlier books on Missouri between 1861 and 1870, summarizes the process by which the Radical Republicans, a new political force which included "an amazing potpourri of the discontented," gained control of the state government in 1864 and attempted to reconstruct Missouri along progressive lines. Their program included the establishment of a public school system for both blacks and whites, the creation of state agricultural and immigration agencies, an eight-hour work law, and general banking and incorporation laws. In their efforts to protect these gains, however, the Radicals engaged in "excessive measures for suppressing the opposition. They thereby aroused enmities" and "forged within the opposition an esprit de corps based on a martyr complex which produced sufficient unity at election time to keep the Democrats in power in
Missouri for the next thirty-five years." Thomas B. Alexander's "Political Reconstruction in Tennessee, 1866-1870," essentially an updated abridgement of the author's 1950 book on this subject, concludes that the dominant theme of political reconstruction in Tennessee was not any attempted program of basic social and economic reform, but rather "simply a struggle for control of the state government between rival groups defined in the tumultuous years preceding Reconstruction."

Professor Curry's study, "Crisis Politics in West Virginia, 1861-1870," draws heavily upon the author's earlier book for background on this "child of the Civil War," and concludes that in West Virginia, "while Reconstruction was characterized by partisan strife, violence, personal vindictiveness, and ultimately by Liberal Republican attempts at accommodation, the only real political question at issue was that of loyalty versus disloyalty. Otherwise, West Virginia politics in the postbellum period, with the exception of the establishment of a public school system, may be characterized as the politics of negative liberalism." Ross A. Webb's "Kentucky: 'Pariah Among the Elect,'" is an original study which attempts to refute the "myth" created by E. Merton Coulter's 1926 book on The Civil War and Readjustment in Kentucky, that Kentucky was a "pro-Confederate state." Carrying his investigation at points up to 1877, Webb finds that "Reconstruction in Kentucky was not as black as it has been made out to be," and that "any discussion of Reconstruction must point out that congressional intervention in Kentucky produced the strong desire to protect the domestic rights of the state from being absorbed by the federal government. It was this reaction," concludes Webb, "that prompted historians to call Kentucky 'pro-Confederate' in the Reconstruction period, when in reality it was anti-administration and anti-congressional in its sentiment."

Charles L. Wagandt, author of an earlier study of Negro emancipation in Maryland, contributes an essay on "Redemption or Reaction—Maryland in the Post-Civil War Years." Noting that in addition to overthrowing its old political order, Maryland was also the first border state to abolish slavery, his general conclusions nevertheless indicate a record of reaction rather than redemption. Radicalism "pushed too far in abusing power through military force and disenfranchisement," and with the nation again united "Marylanders could safely indulge this distaste for radical policies and their revulsion at Negro advancement. They turned to the custodians of the old order, the Democratic party, whose hierarchy was steeped in sympathy for the South." In "Reconstruction in Delaware," Harold B. Hancock, author of a book on Delaware during the Civil War, observes that during the Reconstruction era Delaware "was not occupied by federal troops, nor did she harbor carpetbaggers, scalawags, and the Ku-Klux Klan. Election irregularities increased, but the wholesale corruption and violence characteristic of political contests in some Southern states did not develop." "Political control," Hancock concludes, "passed from the Democrats to the Republicans, who had close ties with the economic interests of Philadelphia and New York. The Negro took his first step
toward acquiring civil rights, but remained a second-class citizen.... Under the leadership of industrial Wilmington the state decided that its future lay with the North rather than with the South."

The three concluding essays survey developments in these same six states with regard to specific topics. Jacqueline Balk and Ari Hoogenboom find "The Origins of Border State Liberal Republicanism" in the political turmoil which began with the election of 1860. According to the authors, "the interplay of geography, war, tradition, slavery, race, and personal ambition determined the tortuous course politics would take over the next decade." After a rapid and selective summary of political developments they conclude that "whether Radical or Democrat, border state ruling elites found themselves under increasing pressure by 1869. Intra-party schisms accompanied by increasing social and economic unrest, demanded new leaders and new policies," but that "post war state political factionalism was too weak a foundation for a permanent Liberal Republican structure."

The text concludes with two valuable original studies based upon neglected records in the National Archives. W. Augustus Low has made a thorough study of the Records of the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands (Record Group 105) to reconstruct and assess the education program of "The Freedmen's Bureau in the Border States," and William Gillette, author of *The Right to Vote: Politics and the Passage of the Fifteenth Amendment* (1965), has analyzed the Source-Chronological File for these six states in the General Records of the Department of Justice (Record Group 60), to detail his "Anatomy of a Failure: Federal Enforcement of the Right to Vote in the Border States during Reconstruction." A brief section of bibliographical essays on sources for each study is followed by a rather brief index, confined chiefly to proper names.

In his introduction Professor Curry observes that "the fact that nineteenth-century politics on the national level was primarily a reflection of conflicts and cleavages within the States themselves would seem to be self-evident. The present state of Reconstruction historiography suggests that it is not." The studies he has brought together should not only help correct this situation but also constitute valuable contributions in their own right to our knowledge and understanding of the Reconstruction Era.

**National Archives and Records Service**

**Frank B. Evans**


In this stimulating book, the outgrowth of a doctoral dissertation at the University of North Carolina, Professor Gaston, an Alabamian and Director of Graduate Studies in History at the University of Virginia, explores the history and impact of a remarkably durable regional image. Although the term is usually associated with a famous speech before an audience of Northern businessmen in New York in 1886, the speaker, the youthful editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, Henry W. Grady, was not its originator. Both the Union officer and *New York Times* correspondent Capt. Adam
Badeau and the former Confederate propagandist Edwin De Leon had already used it as a label for the new order in the South that first evolved a coherent program in the 1880's.

Developing simultaneously with the romantic idealized legend of the Old South which Southern authors like Joel Chandler Harris and Thomas Nelson Page helped to foster, the term “New South” did not always convey a clear-cut meaning. As used by Grady and his fellow journalist Richard H. Edmonds, it implied the harmonious reconciliation of sectional differences, racial peace, and a new economic and social order based on industry and diversified agriculture. In time it became a description not of what ought to be but of what already was. As such, it served the purpose of interest groups opposed to change.

Among the leading spokesmen of the New South creed were the Southern-born Daniel A. Tompkins, Henry Watterson, and Walter Hines Page (whom Gaston regards as “the most gifted and the most complex” of the New South spokesmen); two Pennsylvanians, Congressman William D. Kelley and Col. Alexander K. McClure; and the Negro author of the “Atlanta Compromise,” Booker T. Washington.

Essentially the “New South” was an optimistic creed that sought to identify the region with the American success story. By “bringing the mills to the cotton” and seeking to attract Northern immigrants of safe Anglo-Saxon pedigree to the new Southern mill towns, the South proposed to identify itself with the “progress” that its agrarian past had been unable to achieve. Yet, as Gaston points out, the New South dream remained unfulfilled. The South was still the poorest and economically least progressive section of the nation, constituting in the words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1938 “the nation’s No. 1 economic problem.” Also the doctrine of “equal but separate,” which Grady fathered, failed to create the harmonious biracial society that the New South spokesmen had projected. Gaston does not explain the reasons for this disappointing outcome, since he regards them as lying beyond the scope of his study.

For the historian of ideas, as well as for students of Southern history and race relations, this is a useful book, well organized, cogent, and generally clear. One wonders, however, whether the South is not treated too much as an isolated phenomenon and whether the author has not failed to grapple sufficiently with the issue of how much freedom of action the South actually possessed, given the complexities of the race problem, the South’s credit difficulties, and the defects of the political system of the country as a whole. Also it would appear that a more generous sampling of Negro opinion of the New South creed might have given a broader dimension to this study. Gaston makes no mention, for example, of David A. Straker who moved from South Carolina to Detroit and severely criticized political conditions, race prejudice, and economic oppression in his New South Investigated (Detroit, 1888).

This reviewer cannot help speculating about which myths of the third quarter of the twentieth century will challenge some future intellectual historian like Professor Gaston. Will the field for such clinicians of present
day phobias and fantasies embrace notions like the “Eastern Establishment” against which Barry Goldwater unsuccessfully tilted, and the concept of illimitable American military power that has recently been put to the test in Southeast Asia? Professor Gaston’s *The New South Creed* reminds us anew of the fine line that separates myth from reality.

*Chatham College*

**J. CUTLER ANDREWS**


Over the past decade and a half the work of scholars like Robert P. Sharkey, Irwin Unger, and Walter T. K. Nugent has revealed the complex nature of the money question during the Gilded Age. Older theories of simple divisions between adherents of gold and silver, or hard and soft money, have been discarded in favor of more sophisticated views on the impact of financial policy upon American society. Political alignments did not follow strict regional or class lines, but were based on an intricate interplay of economic, moral and partisan forces. This wave of research and writing has transformed the currency issue from a neglected feature of post-Civil War life into one of the most intensively studied aspects of the years after 1865.

Professor Weinstein’s examination of the origins of the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 adds fresh insights to this controversy. Wide-ranging investigations in manuscript materials, as well as a thorough mastery of official documents and newspapers, enable him to supply new information and offer a provocative interpretation of this first battle over silver.

An early chapter provides the best available discussion of the alleged “Crime of 1873.” Weinstein shows that the demonetization of silver was no conspiracy, but rather a wise and shrewd response of intelligent administrators and politicians to what they perceived as a genuine problem. Faced with the prospect of a declining price of silver and an apparent threat to the national credit, the Director of the Mint, the Secretary of the Treasury, and their Senate allies sought and achieved legislation to meet the situation. They did so in accord with normal Congressional procedures, and cannot be held accountable for mental lapses by potential opponents. Weinstein’s treatment of this episode is conclusive.

The myth of “The Bonanza Kings” also receives tart treatment from the author. Thorough digging in Treasury records in the National Archives disclosed that the major owners of American silver mines had little economic need to press for the remonetization of silver in the 1870’s. These men had a reliable customer for their product in the government itself, and would have gained nothing from disturbing this relationship. Weinstein’s detective work on this question demonstrates once again how few of the accepted bromides about the Gilded Age will survive close scrutiny.

The book’s major thesis is equally convincing. The battle over silver in the 1870’s was a transitional episode. It looked back to the quarrels over finance during Reconstruction, and was a last gasp in the warfare between
the hard and soft money camps. At the same time, the debate in the Congress and the country over the fate of the white metal allowed both sides to test arguments and solutions that would reappear in the 1890's. Weinstein wisely cautions against reading back the positions of goldbugs and silverites into the very different context of 1873-1878.

For all its merits, the book has some lapses that may deny it a wide audience. The author can write well, as his epilogue indicates, but his prose is often more tortured and murky than the legislation he describes. Some chapters are poorly organized and repetitious; others could have been shortened and tightened. Weinstein had a difficult assignment. Legislative history is rarely exciting. But he has failed to compress peripheral details, and to make his narrative a coherent whole.

The defects of presentation do not invalidate his important contribution. His book joins a growing number that are destroying the traditional picture of Gilded Age America. The currency controversy, like the tariff, railroad regulation, and the trusts illustrates that the era was far from sterile. The level of discussion, in and out of Congress, was very high. To those who treat the period with condescension or contempt, Weinstein's study will be a useful corrective.

Fifteen years of attention to the money question has brought significant rewards for historians of the late nineteenth century. A reading of this book suggests that similar investigations of equally important matters are long overdue. There are now half a dozen books and innumerable articles on the currency issue. Yet no modern study of the tariff as a political and economic topic exists. Perhaps the 1970's will be as fruitful for students of protection as the 1960's have been for scholars of monetary history after 1865.

University of Texas at Austin

LEWIS L. GOULD


The title of this book does not refer, as some cinemagoers might have suspected, to the recent movie on the Molly Maguires. Mr. McCarthy has brooded so long over the part played by Franklin B. Gowen in creating the Molly Maguire legend that he has convinced himself that the Mollies were only a figment of Gowen's imagination. A speech he delivered on this theme so interested the editor of the Wyoming Observer that he asked Mr. McCarthy to produce a series of twelve newspaper articles on the subject, which have been brought together to form this book. Series is perhaps the wrong word to use, since the articles were written without any apparent pattern and are rambling, repetitious, and incoherent, both individually and collectively; Gowen's suicide, for instance, is described in four of the twelve articles.

Slapdash as journalism, the work is impossible as history! It violates every rule in the book. Invective and imagination take the place of evidence, and anonymous "historians" and "scholars" are cited to back up extravagant claims. Even direct quotations are garbled so that they make
the person quoted say what he did not say. Most serious fault of all is the lack of critical judgment. The author accepts any statement favorable to his cause, no matter how biased the source, and rejects as false evidence that which conflicts with his preconception. When a defense attorney attacks James McParlan, his words are taken as truth; when the prosecuting lawyer condemns the Mollies, his charges are denounced as lies.

Even with all this distortion of the evidence, the author fails to make out a good case. All his assertions and insinuations about the character of Gowen and McParlan cannot conceal the incontrovertible fact that McParlan did join a secret society, sometimes called the Molly Maguires, and that members of this society did commit murders, and Mr. McCarthy never really tries to deny this. All his work adds up to is a sensational exaggeration of the conclusions of every responsible scholar in the field, that the Molly Maguires were not as bad as Gowen painted them.

The author is much more successful with his sub-thesis, that Jack Kehoe was innocent of the crime for which he was hanged. Here he is on much safer ground, since even at the time it was fairly obvious that Kehoe was being executed, not for murdering Frank Langdon fifteen years before, but for being head of the Schuylkill County Mollies. Mr. McCarthy had the benefit of some new information on this subject, since the Kehoe family agreed to tell him what they knew about their ancestor. Unfortunately, there is no way to distinguish this family tradition from the author's own guesses. Nevertheless, the book does give a clearer picture of Kehoe the man than we have had before and prints enough of the documents to remove any doubt that may have existed as to Kehoe's innocence.

Perhaps the greatest service of this work is that it brings to print all the pro-Molly legends that have survived underground in the anthracite region for nearly a century. This is the story of the prosecution of the Mollies as it appeared to their friends then and their descendants since. Legends are not history, but a knowledge of them is essential to understanding history.

Norfolk State College, Norfolk, Va. 

Marvin W. Schlegel


During the four years covered by these two volumes the thought and personality of Woodrow Wilson assume the dimensions that would determine his career in the academic and political worlds alike. Early in their pages, Frederick Jackson Turner described the enigma of his onetime Baltimore companion. Wilson was "homely, solemn, young, glum but with the fire in his face and eye that means that its possessor is not of the common crowd"; yet, he was also "a happy father" who could spend the "afternoon telling the most delightful stream of anecdotes and epigrams" and captivating Turner with his "fund of stories." Wilson himself recognized that it was the season in his life when he had not only "come into
the possession of such powers” that he had, “but also into the ability to estimate them with just insight.” While acknowledging that “work and paternity are ‘calculated’ to sober a fellow,” Wilson wrote his wife Ellen that “a distinct feeling of maturity—or rather of maturing—has come over me.” It was “the feeling that I am no longer young . . . and that I need no longer hesitate (as I have so long and sensitively done) to assert myself and my opinions in the presence of and against the selves and opinions of old men.”

Certainly Wilson’s call to Princeton contributed to his new sense of pride in self and work. While his friend Turner at Wisconsin found he “had occasion to consider recently some of the less pleasant aspects of State universities” and had begun to “grow weary of having to keep one eye off my work in order to look out for my official head,” Wilson reported to his aging father “that everybody regards my election to P. as a sort of crowning success: congratulations pour in from all sides.” The new Princeton don cited authority for this common estimate of his good fortune. From the magisterial precincts of Harvard, Albert Bushnell Hart congratulated him on succeeding to a position which “will affect the political method of thought of the most influential class in the next generation.” Even at old Nassau there would be the usual inconveniences of any academic position. “Hazing prevails in the faculty,” complained Wilson, “and to a dreadful extent, the President himself taking part in it.” He was “a victim” of what was misnamed “committee work, but in reality is very much worse than that . . . a form of torture, prolonged and horrid.” Small matter, though, when Wilson could register this complaint in an address before the prestigious Philadelphia Alumni.

There would have to be the usual compromises as well. Though friends could lay down the “trains of influence” that made for advancement, they would have to be traveled with prudence. Academic freedom had its definable limits in Wilson’s day as it does in our own. President Patton wrote Wilson of “one or two criticisms” that he heard regarding Wilson’s work on the State. The admonition could not have been less indirect as Patton asserted that “in your discussion of the origin of the State you minimize the supernatural and make such unqualified application of the doctrine of naturalistic evolution and the genesis of the State as to leave the reader of your pages in a state of uncertainty as to your own position.” Scepticism in any mode was intolerable. Lest there be any misunderstanding as to what was expected, Patton warned “that the Trustees of the college mean to keep this College on the old ground of loyalty to the Christian religion: that they expect the high topics pertaining to your chair . . . to be dealt with under theistic and Christian presuppositions.” Wilson was perceptive enough to pierce the veil of divinity with which the Trustees covered themselves and their objections. This “certain too influential group of men in our Board” were “business men, the moneymen of the corporation . . . hardheaded, narrow men—that’s the breed.” But the requisite obsequies must be paid. An editor of a popular journal expressed his hope to the young professor for “two or three articles which
will stimulate national and municipal patriotism.” Wilson contributed “The True American Spirit.”

The search for that elusive “true American spirit” was much on Wilson’s mind in these years. It weighed heavily on this generation of the nineties. Many thought the country had fully recuperated from the horror of the Civil War, only to be confronted with new—and for them—alien divisions in society. The center had to hold, but it needed a redefinition of American national identity to keep it poised. The way the experience of the Civil War was interpreted had much bearing on that redefinition. Wilson, like Turner and others, believed that “our civil war . . . was a final contest between nationalism and sectionalism.” The war established the Union “in a new character and strength which it had not at first possessed, but which the steady advance of the national development, and of the national idea thereby begotten, had in effect at length bestowed upon it.” Since the result was to make “the country . . . homogeneous throughout,” there was “no longer any reason why the South should not become like the rest of the country.” A speaker at the Johns Hopkins Seminary voiced the major corollary of this regional theme: “Slavery . . . is not to be considered the cause of the war.” But if the war was caused by ‘sectionalism,’ whence came the national idea that triumphed with the war’s end?

Wilson and Turner had discussed the problem in their days together at Hopkins and had come upon that element which provided the base for the consensus nationalist history that their generation of “progressive” scholars enunciated and that still determines much of what passes for ‘scientific’ history.” Wilson wrote Turner: “You remember, I suppose, our talks in Baltimore on the growth of the national idea, of nationality in our history, and our agreement that the role of the west in this development was a very great, a leading role.” So America would discover itself on the frontier. Its identity would be certified by its expansionism. There all divisions in its society would be healed by a nationalist cure. It had been so in the past and it would be so in the present. As slavery was relegated to a minor role in this new mythical past, and as the America of Wilson’s day turned from the problems of race that slavery left in our history, it would turn from other divisive forces that made for social crisis. The Winning of the West became a perpetual struggle for Americans, for they would always esteem it a triumphant tour of a nation united, a nation liberated from doubt, and at last itself, at last American.

Wilson also shared the organic view of society that was a key to the cosmology of this nationalist history. Like Burke, he believed that “there are no individual discoveries to be made in politics . . . . Society is an organism which does not develop by the cunning leadership of a single member so much as by a slow maturing and all-round adjustment, though led at last into self consciousness and self-command by those who best divine the laws of its growth.” It was an axiom of politics that “in no case may we safely hurry the organism away from its habit.” Change in America was always organic. Speaking in commemoration of the Constitution’s
centennial, Wilson could say of the American Revolution that "there was nothing revolutionary in its movements: It had not to overthrow other politics: It had only to organize itself." In Wilson's conservative vision of its past, America retained its uniqueness in history for "there is no communion between their democracy and the radical thought and restless spirit called by that name in Europe." We were one people, made so by our peculiar history. Yet there were dangers threatening the organic body politic of America. The old world with its woes and its history from which America was an escape was threatening corruption of our pristine experiment: "... our own temperate blood schooled to self-possession, and to the measured conduct of self-government is receiving a constant infusion and yearly experiencing a partial corruption of foreign blood ... our own equable habits have been crossed with the feverish habits of the restless old world."

The editors provide extensive prefatory notes to some of Wilson's most famous published works of this period. Foremost among them was his textbook, *The State*. Some of Wilson's words in that volume served as harbingers of his future political campaigns: "... it is not competition that kills, but unfair competition. ... The regulation that I mean is not interference; it is the equalization of conditions, so far as possible, in all branches of endeavor; and the equalization of conditions is the very opposite of interference." A traditional reformist note was struck with Wilson's insistence that "to secure popular education the action of society as a whole is necessary and popular education is indispensable to that equalization of the conditions of personal development which we have taken to be the proper object of society." The editors note that Wilson had some innovative plans for a School of Law at Princeton. Its graduates "would give leadership in adapting the law to new necessities as the United States moved from a rural economy into an urban industrial way of life. Only lawyers with a deeply informed Zeitgeist could perform this indispensable function." They carefully point out that "... it is just as important to note that Wilson made ample provision in his curriculum for courses that would fit lawyers for the common, day to day business of their profession." In his Lecture on Democracy, Wilson appears to have lost his earlier aversion for political parties as instruments of reform: "Parties preserve impulses which could otherwise be diffused and lost. They must be forgiven much of their worship of 'dead issues' for they can keep their corporate feeling, their sense of identity only by remembering old struggles."

Toward the close of these volumes, feelers were put out to Wilson to accept the Presidency of the University of Illinois. He rejected them only after using them with the administrators at Princeton to gain a pay boost. There was one lure to the Illinois offer, however. It would "demand all my energies (including those of the latent politician within me)." The desire for the active life of politics was never that latent in these volumes. Throughout their pages, there seemed to be a continuous conflict going on in the man's soul between standing apart as a commentator or actively
participating as leader. That this inner debate surfaced in scholarly prose did not detract from its seriousness. And it remained unresolved at the end no matter how reconciled Wilson thought himself to be with his position at Princeton. The roles of the literary man and the leader of men sought command of his personality and their pressure was continuous. The former was not one “who earns his victories through the publishers and his defeats at the hands of the men who manage the primaries.” Wilson viewed him as “the man who has the genius to see deep into affairs and the discretion to keep out of them . . . a man to whom, by reason of knowledge and imagination and sympathy, government and policies are as an open book.” Not every scholar could be such for “even though he be an eminent historian, [he] is ill enough fitted to be a mentor in the affairs of government . . . things are for the most part, very simple in books . . . Not at all the bindings of a library enclose the world of circumstance.” Yet one with the right temperament “stands apart and looks on with humorous sympathy at the play of politics; he will tell you what the players are thinking about: He divines at once how the parts are cast: He knows before hand what each Act is to discover: He could readily guess what the dialogue is to contain . . .”

Yet the role of the activist leader was also on Wilson’s mind. The editors rightly call his essay on the subject “a highly personal statement.” They comment that the lecture is “a remarkable reflection of the Victorian faith in the almost inevitable working out of political progress” and that “it seems highly probable that the warm evangelical preaching of his pastor at Middletown, Dr. Azel W. Hazen, had already begun to catalyze Wilson’s political as well as theological thought.” The leadership Wilson described was one in the politics of morality, for it was based, the editors argue, on “the Christian Law of love . . . the only force that could unite societies and provide the proper motivation.” Yet the skeptic might hesitate as Wilson asserted that “men are as clay in the hands of the consummate leader” or as he intoned that “. . . in the midst of all stands the leader, gathering as best he can, the thoughts that are completed; reckoning the gathered gain, perceiving the fruits of toil and war—and combining these into words of progress, into acts of recognition and completion.”

Wilson’s description of leadership may appear overdone—indeed ominous—but like many Americans before and since, he recognized a social crisis was upon his country. He had his prescription for it—a rather conservative one but not one to cause surprise, for it pulled together the many skeins of his thought into a whole net to capture the imagination of America: “America is now sauntering through her resources and through the mazes of her politics with easy nonchalance; but presently there will come a time when she will be surprised to find herself grown old—a country crowded, strained, perplexed—when she will be obliged to fall back upon her conservatism obliged to pull herself together, adopt a new regimen of life, husband her resources, concentrate her strength, steady her methods, sober her views, restrict her vagaries, trust her best, not her average members. That will be the time of change.”

Vincent A. Carrafiello

The University of Connecticut

Professor McFarland’s task of unraveling the complexities of the John L. Lewis-Franklin D. Roosevelt relationship is an undertaking which would make any student of recent American history envious. The studied contrasts between the self-educated Lucas, Iowa, coal miner and the Hyde Park aristocrat provide a convenient vehicle for presenting the frequently diametrically opposing oratorical, political and managerial techniques of these two self-willed men. In an era filled with colorful men and episodes most certainly the Lewis-Roosevelt courtship in 1933, marriage of convenience throughout the mid-thirties, and growing disenchantment in the latter part of the decade which culminated with the abrasive split in 1940 is a significant story. McFarland’s narrative gives insight into the key men involved and offers interpretations of the broader aspects of labor-government relationships. The Lewis-Roosevelt relationship was frequently emotional, often humorous, but always complex; this is particularly true when attempting to assess the implications of their maneuverings at the national level.

Throughout the book McFarland entwines the clash of these dominant figures with the chronology of New Deal labor activity, but it is obvious that the writer is most perceptive and interesting when describing the Lewis-Roosevelt relationship. The story of the Republican Lewis’s gradual attraction to New Deal programs, his anticipation of influencing the President, and his gradual disillusionment with the White House’s perplexing impartiality at the time he was attempting to forward the cause of industrial unionism are well known. Even though the author is skillful in relating these events his presentation adds nothing substantially new to our knowledge of these developments. However, his argument that Roosevelt “failed outright” to grasp the political significance of the industrial union movement, and his interpretation of labor’s political activity in the 1936 presidential election, question traditional assumptions in this chapter in labor history. More valuable to the student of the period is the recurring theme of the mental and political machinations between Lewis and Roosevelt. From the evidence presented one must conclude that despite obvious differences in personal political styles, both men had much in common, particularly concerning the operation of the democratic-capitalistic system. McFarland frequently alludes to the pragmatic and opportunistic philosophies of the two men which permitted them wide-ranging ideological latitude and which often resulted in seemingly contradictory actions. The author is correct in his assumption that the Lewis-Roosevelt relationship has alternately been over-simplified or made more complex than it actually was. Roosevelt was attempting to retain the support of the majority of Americans, while Lewis represented one particular pressure group. As the New Deal domestic reform program came to an end and the President’s interests gravitated to the international scene the split became quite predictable and unavoidable.
McFarland's book is well written and interesting, but in some respects it is superficial. For instance, Lewis's relationship to AFL President William Green and Roosevelt during the craft vs. industrial union controversy is not satisfactorily developed—if the discussion had employed more detail and analysis, the results would have been more satisfying. On other occasions, as in the discussion of Lewis's interest in UMW Vice-President Tom Kennedy's Pennsylvania gubernatorial ambitions, and Lewis's reaction to the President's interest in the European War, the accounts are so brief as to be misleading. In the former instance an evaluation of Lewis's political ineffectiveness in the anthracite mining regions would have had to be examined, and in the latter episode the UMW's traditional isolationist policies as espoused in World War I and retained thereafter, make Lewis's statements in 1940 more meaningful. McFarland fails the reader by not expanding his labors into a more comprehensive work—nevertheless his basic goal of making the Lewis-Roosevelt relationship more understandable is eminently successful.

Bloomsburg State College

J. R. SPERRY


The entire content of this volume consists of Solwell File's dialect commentaries. Files was a Pennsylvania German columnist for the Allentown Democrat during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Melville J. Boyer, for many years prior to his retirement the editor of the Proceedings, provided the English translations on the facing pages. The collection of dialect commentaries on the social and political life of Lehigh County is divided into categories such as "Times Have Changed," "Groundhog Day and The Seasons," "Hard Times and Taxes," "Politics and Party Meetings," "Picnics, Frolics, Family Reunions," "Women, Marriage, Styles," "Barroom Loafers and Tramps," and "Food and Vendues."

To a reviewer whose entire understanding of the Pennsylvania Deutsch dialect is limited to "Grumbiere," a vestige of his early childhood when dinner at his paternal grandmother's home was fraught with the perils of starvation unless some item of food was requested in "Deutsch," the effort of assessing the work is no mean task. Mr. Boyer's translations made the task delightful and meaningful. Any person who regards the Pennsylvania German (or "Dutchman" as the popular expression goes) as humorless just has not read the literary output of P-G writers.

Solwell Files was the pen-name of Elwood Daniel Fisher (1857-1921), a native of eastern Berks County. Fisher was a railroad telegrapher and station agent. His contributions to the Allentown Democrat numbered 351 columns, covering the years 1888 to 1906 except for a five-year span from 1890 to 1895 during which time he worked for a western railroad.

When the scholars engaged in intellectual history get around to studying the rural American mind, they will find Mr. Boyer's careful analyses on the roles of dialect columnists fruitful. The dialect linguists must share with the
social and political historians a professional responsibility for examining the articulations of our countrymen, their philosophy as well as their art.

In his section on “Times Have Changed” we find Solwell Files complaining that youth in 1900 was not having as much fun as the columnist had in his younger days (1870’s). Not only did the snowfall dwindle, but the young people in 1900 did not know how to dance. The girls came in for plenty of criticism in Files’s commentaries. He thought they took too long to dress and spray themselves with perfume. Fellows, he observed, “stink like a soot-kettle (ruse-kessel) from cigarettes which contain no tobacco ... from them they get as crazy as a tom-cat.” In 1901 Files took a look at the last century, and inventoried its liabilities and assets; among the former were the war in China and the Philippines, Governor Stone’s school appropriation cut, and the McKinley Administration. The reader should be aware by this time that Solwell Files was a staunch member of the Lehigh County Democracy, and his comments in the Democrat reached many sympathetic eyes.

Sixty-eight years ago Files decried the prevailing philosophy of folks wanting higher pay for less work. Times have changed—for his fellow Eastern Populists! The Supreme Court’s decision against the income tax law in 1895 moved Files to a comment that could have been expected: “Big fish never eat themselves.” The columnist reflected the wrath of the rural market farmers on the proposal that farmers should pay a huckster tax to Allentown.

In 1900 Files broke with his fellow Democrat and railroader, George Baer of the Reading Railroad over the issue of the anthracite coal strike. He was discreet, however, in avoiding any mention of Baer’s leadership in the strikebreaking among the coal mine operators; instead, he attacked the Republican administrations in Harrisburg and Washington. The proposal to tax bicycles one dollar brought forth a roar: “Next, I suppose, they’ll also tax wheelbarrows and baby coaches (shubkarrich un bavie coaches) to raise money for the Quay machine to spend.”

Among Files’s pet peeves were banks, moral reformers, sophisticated girls and women, effete young men, temperance, Republicans, industrialists, loafers, trolley car operators, doctors, lawyers, and ministers.

The columnist’s dry humor comes through in many of his comments. To wit: “When the Groundhog returns we will be able to breathe better again, but now we had better sing low and pass the time on the wood- chest back of the stove and read the Bible, the Democrat, and other religious books. . . .”

Sowell’s proverbs are collected at the end of his commentaries. Here are a few: “One lousy calf sometimes makes a whole herd lousy”; “A crooked cover does not fit on a perfect kettle”; “A mouse-hole does not chase a mouse”; “Drown and you will not hang”; and, “Poverty is no disgrace, but mighty unhandy.”

Lancaster County Historical Society

John Ward Willson Loose
For the Reputation of Truth
Politics, Religion, and Conflict among the Pennsylvania Quakers, 1750-1800
RICHARD BAUMAN
The period 1750-1800 was significant for the Quakers of Pennsylvania. Active in state politics, they suddenly confronted a series of political crises which seemed to compromise their traditional Quaker pacifism. Using anthropological approaches and perspectives, the author examines the Quakers’ response to these issues to reach a new interpretation of their history.

Coming in the fall, $10.00

The Best Poor Man’s Country
A Geographical Study of Early Southeastern Pennsylvania
JAMES T. LEMON
The development of an entire region in Pennsylvania during the eighteenth century is the subject of this geographical history. The settlement of the land, the geographical and social mobility of the people, territorial organization of farms, towns, and counties, and regional variations in land use are discussed in this new addition to the growing body of microcosmic historical studies.

Coming in the fall, about $12.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY STUDIES

The Negro in Pennsylvania History, No. 11 in the Pennsylvania Historical Association's Historical Studies series, has just been published. This 68-page booklet presents a comprehensive survey of the social, legal, political, and cultural progress of a people, starting with the settlement of the Delaware Valley. The author is Ira V. Brown, professor of history at Pennsylvania State University. Like the other Pennsylvania Historical Studies, it will serve as a useful course supplement for teacher and student (it contains a bibliography), and will be an enlightening experience for the general reader.

Dr. Phillip E. Stebbins
Secretary, The Pennsylvania Historical Association
Department of History
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Enclosed please find a check payable to The Pennsylvania Historical Association in the amount of $____________ for the following numbers of the Pennsylvania History Studies:

- No. 1—Gilbert, A Picture of the Pennsylvania Germans ($1.00)
- No. 2—Comfort, The Quakers ($1.00)
- No. 7—Sweetnam, Pennsylvania Transportation ($0.75)
  Revised Edition ($1.00)
- No. 8—Russ, Pennsylvania's Boundaries ($1.00)
- No. 9—Brown, Pennsylvania Reformers ($1.00)
- No. 10—Richman, Pennsylvania's Architecture ($1.25)
- No. 11—Brown, The Negro in Pennsylvania History ($1.00)

To be mailed to (PLEASE PRINT):

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________