BOOK REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTES

EDITED BY NORMAN B. WILKINSON


As increasing numbers of historians become interested in quantitative techniques and the application of electronic computers to historical analysis, manuals designed for the special problems historians face and using examples drawn from historical studies will undoubtedly appear. However at present the two volumes under review represent the only books of their kind and as such deserve to be read by all historians even those who only care to know what the quantifiers are up to.

The Historian and the Computer by Edward Shorter, who teaches European social history at the University of Toronto, is the briefer and more elementary of the two books and can be recommended for students at any level. While he touches on the subject of quantitative history and gives a number of examples of ways historians have used computers, the main part of the book is devoted to showing the historian what he "need know in order to prepare information to be fed into an electronic computer, to make it do his bidding, and to analyse the figures the machine produces." He is far more concerned with practical things that one should know about designing a code book or electronically processing one's data than larger theoretical questions. His chapters on statistics are intentionally elementary designed to make historians aware of the types of statistics available and the kinds of data to which they are applicable rather than to explain their logical and mathematical bases. He ends the book with a brief series of warnings which reveal a clear understanding of some of the psychological aspects of doing history with computers that must be understood by anyone who wishes to follow this path. In general, The Historian and the Computer is a well written and often witty little book which achieves its limited purposes.

Historian's Guide to Statistics by Charles Dollar and Richard Jensen, who both teach American political history, is a quite different book, encyclopedic in scope. Opening with a vigorous defense of quantitative methods the authors rush the reader through a whirlwind tour of statistics and data processing, and conclude with a comprehensive sixty-one-page "Guide to Resources of Value in Quantitative Historical Research." All in all it is a technical tour de force touching nearly every subject of interest.
in the area and showing a grasp of statistics that most social scientists would envy. Yet, Jensen and Dollar have tried to do too much and their book, which merits a permanent place on the shelves of those writing quantitative history, will probably have only limited classroom use. Jensen and Dollar present a wider range of statistics than do most introductory texts in three times the space; thus, their relation of the use of each to statistical reasoning is overly brief. The book is also marred by drab writing and dogmatic judgments. At a time when social scientists are reassessing the merits and techniques of ecological analysis—an almost indispensable approach for historians—Dollar and Jensen hew to the legacy of W. S. Robinson. Similarly, it seems a shame that at this point in the development of quantitative history any method should be arbitrarily rejected. Yet Dollar and Jensen—for reasons that are unclear since the position they take represents only one side in a rather complex methodological argument—summarily reject the possibility of the use of factor analysis in historical studies. Regardless of these problems, anyone interested in the way statistics have been used by historians and ways in which they are likely in the near future to affect historical analysis will, eventually, have to come to terms with this book.

Lehigh University

WILLIAM C. SHADE


Raymond Steams died a few weeks after this large volume appeared in print. Twenty years of careful, enthusiastic study had gone into its preparation. The honors and praise which his book has already received would have given him much justified satisfaction.

At the core of his work is a systematic, and in several cases exhaustive, review of the scientific endeavors of all those Fellows of the Royal Society of London who did significant research in British America before 1776. There are some fifty of these; and he convinces us (more on the basis of his authority than by hard proof) that this group really does include just about everyone who made a tangible contribution to science in the "Old Colonial Era." For source material Steams draws heavily on the records of the Royal Society and the private correspondence of several of its Fellows. Wherever historical studies already exist on a given figure, Steams quickly sums up their message before moving on to add new information and to present his own, highly independent appraisal of the subject’s scientific significance. Even about such familiar figures as John Winthrop, Jr., or Benjamin Franklin, Steams has a fresh and credible point of view.

But it must not be thought that this is merely a collection of biographical essays. Steams groups his biographies geographically and chronologically and comments collectively on each group in a most informative way. The first four chapters describe the general state of European and especially British science in the seventeenth century both internally and externally, with particular emphasis on the impact of the discovery of
America on European scientific knowledge. The modern historian of science will find the approach here somewhat old-fashioned but still useful and uniquely conceived. In chapters five through seven, Stearns deals with the scientific explorations during the period of first settlement in Virginia, New England, the West Indies and Hudson's Bay. The next three chapters are devoted to the emergence of resident or native scientists in the colonies and to their communications with each other and with the Royal Society. Up to this time, 1720, the “scientist” in the New World is but a “field agent” gathering data and specimens for European scientists. But beginning with Cotton Mather and for the remainder of the Colonial period (treated in the last chapter) the scientist in British America also occasionally contributes ideas.

Stearns identifies some fourteen men who made conceptual contributions but admits that only Franklin is of really significant stature. “Much of the basic scientific research in America was inferior to that of Europe, and its quality fell far short of that of the Old World. There were wide areas of scientific knowledge very little explored and almost wholly undeveloped in America.” Mathematics, chemistry, physiology were very weak; astronomy, navigation, oceanography and physics showed some activity; but the largest number of contributions by far came in the biological sciences, in taxonomy, botany and zoology, epidemiology and plant breeding. Stearns does not explain why he draws such a sharp line between science and technology, but he admits that much which he left out could be classed as a scientific component of an admittedly vigorous Colonial technology. Further, by defining science as only research and hypothesizing, he can omit discussing the role played by schools and colleges in disseminating scientific learning and values among the Colonial population.

If the book has a thesis, it is this: that the respectable showing of American Colonial science would have been far weaker had it not been for the constant support, physical and ideological, of the Royal Society and several of its members. As partial proof, Steams points to the decline of science in the United States after independence despite the efforts of the American Philosophical Society and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. To this reviewer his thesis is convincing and it invites comparison with the promotion of science by the Royal Society elsewhere in the World. Parallel studies evaluating the influence of the French, Spanish and Russian academies on the scientific activity of their respective empires, would also be most instructive.

For Britain’s American colonies, Steams’s study is definitive. It is doubtful if any significant contributor to science has been left out or that Stearns’s overall picture of Colonial science will be seriously challenged. However, as he himself enumerates in the conclusion, several fruitful research opportunities in Colonial science remain to be undertaken.

The documentation and stylistic quality of this work are exemplary. Only a man of great erudition and discerning judgment could have made the mediocre science of most of his subjects genuinely interesting and historically significant.

University of Delaware

JOHN J. BEER

Dr. John Fothergill is well known to students of Pennsylvania, Quaker, and early medical and scientific history. The manner in which the Quaker doctor reached across the ocean to help build a transatlantic community is well stated in the double meaning of the title of this collection. Although he never visited America, his letters reached from England to extend moral support, gentle advice, and financial aid. He served many Americans who went “home to England” for education or for visits and often they remained his correspondents.

One of the major contributions of the letters here presented is to identify the base from which Fothergill developed his remarkable reach. Earlier selections and accounts have emphasized his role in medicine and science: his importance in the British intellectual world and his success in integrating Americans into it. Two groups of these letters bring into focus previously known but insufficiently attended aspects of his life. The first is his extensive and revealing correspondence with members of his own family and with other British Quakers. These delineate his own strength and leadership in this community; they also reveal interlacings which tied it to the intellectual community.

The other group of letters illuminates Fothergill’s political role. In 1743, he was appointed by the London Yearly Meeting correspondent to the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting and he wrote voluminously in this service. These letters are not new, most of them are found in the Pemberton Papers of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, but their significance is striking. They are by no means limited to religious matters but enter into the most pressing political questions of the day—especially those which most deeply involved the Philadelphia Quakers. Occasional letters to British political leaders supplement this correspondence.

Fothergill’s personal feelings always appear with great honesty. His British patriotism, for example, is well reflected in wartime passages castigating the character and abilities of the French. On the other hand, earnestly as he sought to avert the American War for Independence, he supported the American effort in a way that some of the Philadelphia Quakers could not. He rejected James Logan’s approval of defensive war but he could not remain neutral in spirit during any of Britain’s wars.

His deep understanding of and feeling for the Americans underlay his success in encouraging their development in medicine and science. Very early letters contain references to Thomas Bond, then visiting Fothergill, and John Bartram who was soon to receive his help. Correspondence with both Bartrams, Alexander Garden, Cadwallader Colden, and Benjamin Franklin came later and grew into a rich fabric, for his relationship with each was quite different. He financed William Bartram’s explorations and sent him careful, and unexecuted, instructions. Franklin became his patient and friend; each regarded the other with warm respect. In various ways,
he forwarded the efforts of Philadelphia medical students, especially William Shippen, John Morgan, and Benjamin Rush. He was a patron of the Pennsylvania Hospital and consistently supported efforts to improve medicine in Philadelphia. Even here, however, he retained his independence of view, refusing for example, to endorse Morgan’s attempt to establish a college of physicians.

Each of the editors approached Fothergill from a background of interest in medical history. Their annotation is spare but deft, especially on medical questions. Quaker and family relationships have been well handled, as have most aspects of international science. The sureness of annotation is somewhat less evident in some aspects of American political history, although, even here, the problem is not one of specific error. The picture of Braddock’s defeat seems clouded and rather outdated, and a limited understanding of the Stamp Act is displayed. A large array of individuals and events have been so well identified that the volume constitutes a useful reference resource.

The biggest deficiency in the editing is structural. Every correspondence is a dialogue which runs in two directions but this collection offers only Fothergill’s side of it. Although space limitations must have prohibited the inclusion of letters to Fothergill, the reader should have been informed of the location of such letters when they exist. Very occasionally, the burden of a letter to which Fothergill was responding is noted; it is often much needed. Similarly, the deletion of passages from many letters leaves doubts in the reader’s mind, especially when the deletions are described as “irrelevant introductory passages, pious exhortations not related to the subject in hand, and passages relating to topics amply discussed in other letters.” Such deletions would seem to underrepresent Fothergill’s religious feelings and subjective reactions. They also limit the opportunity to see how he may have tailored the same account to the measure of different correspondents.

This collection is valuable and the editing very good. It is important because of Fothergill’s intrinsic importance as a man, as a Quaker politician, as a physician, and as an amateur naturalist. This importance is multiplied because of his remarkable relationships to American and British affairs—both great and small.

New York University

Brooke Hindle


All students of American history should learn to know and use this superb volume. Professor Gipson has achieved a goal envisaged while a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, in an era when the Empire reached its zenith of glory. The Guide is his fifteenth and final volume in that vast effort which constitutes a life work. I know of no other historian who has pro-
vided such a bibliography for the sources upon which he drew, and probably no other person of our time, save Winston Churchill, could have proceeded on so grand a scale. In 1936 his purpose was foretold in the Preface to Volume I of *The British Empire before the American Revolution*, to produce a record “devoted exclusively to a critical examination of the more important sources for the history of the old British Empire covering the period from the middle of the eighteenth century to the outbreak of the American Revolution.” That he has achieved this none can doubt. This success embodies a symbolic and impressive tribute, as well, to those who trained him and prepared the way.

As a pupil of Charles M. Andrews at Yale, he learned well the principles of historical scholarship from a great preceptor and may be regarded as that master’s most eminent pupil. The Gipson *Guide* is the direct extension of those which Andrews produced for the Bureau of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington sixty years ago, under the leadership of John Franklin Jameson. In the early years of the present century the quality of graduate work heightened, American libraries, universities, and repositories improved rapidly, and academic standards injected a rigid discipline into the profession of history. Major important changes were induced by Jameson, Andrews, George Louis Beer, Herbert L. Osgood, Waldo G. Leland, and other scholars of comparable distinction. They did much to make Americans aware of the foreign archival sources for our history and they awakened the scholarly public to the desirability of far closer attention to our own native resources. Lawrence H. Gipson knew these men, first as pupil, later as colleague. He is of that generation which enjoyed the first benefits of their efforts. His reputation as a scholar, witnessed in this *Guide*, is predicated on the validity of their action. Their decisions have stood the test of time.

While the Andrews guides encompass the entire colonial period of American history, the present volume under review is concerned only with the years between 1748 and 1776, a crucial review era in British history and a vital one in our own. Professor Gipson’s survey of the sources is divided into eleven parts: London depositories; English counties; Wales; Scotland; Northern Ireland; the Republic of Ireland; France; Spain; Canada; the Atlantic and West Indies Islands; and the United States. One perceives in this pattern the influence of the imperial school led by Andrews. Holdings of the Public Record Office and the British Museum, alone, cover the first 173 pages. Many of the papers are reported in detail, with archival referencing in scrupulous form. The second part, devoted to English counties, is of particular interest because it represents an element not embraced by the Andrews volumes. The emergence of local record offices and libraries throughout England now provides American historians with a diverse, fascinating, and ever-growing body of new sources. These facilities, in some measure the result of changes brought by two wars, present a new challenge to those who are now working in American colonial history. While the Historical Manuscripts Commission has published, for many years, surveys of important private collections, these have been
confined largely to muniments of the nobility. Today the steady flow of manuscripts to these repositories, as country houses throughout England change hands and have their contents dispersed, means that scholars can move to the more local level for research. The Gipson survey of these offers an appealing array of sources. As in the case of his citations to the Andrews guides on London repositories, he also includes useful ones to the volume published in 1961 by B. R. Crick and Miriam Alman on manuscripts relating to America in Great Britain and Ireland, a survey made for the British Association for American Studies.

Comparable to the portion on English counties is the part relating to the Atlantic and West Indies Islands. Important advances have been made in the islands in past decades to make the unpublished colonial records more accessible to scholars. The part devoted to Canada is still another example of the great progress made since 1900, best reflected in efforts of the Public Archives at Ottawa, especially in the acquisition of transcripts and photocopies from British and French sources. Attention to pertinent materials in Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, France, and Spain offer additional evidence of the thoroughness of the author's efforts to lay the full record before scholars.

In the final portion of the Guide Professor Gipson deals with manuscripts in the United States. It is very useful to have these for the years 1748-1776 in a single section, especially when used in conjunction with Philip Hamer's guide, Walter Muir Whitehill's study of independent historical societies, the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, Grace G. Griffin's volume on British sources in the Library of Congress, Richard Hale's work on microfilm materials, or the various guides published by historical societies and research libraries. For this review it should be remarked that the section on resources within Pennsylvania is quite useful. It lists papers in the William Penn Memorial Museum and Archives at Harrisburg, Muhlenberg College, the Archives of the Moravian Church, Haverford College Library, The American Philosophical Society, The Free Library of Philadelphia, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, The Library Company of Philadelphia, The Presbyterian Historical Society, The Carnegie Library at Pittsburgh, The Darlington Memorial Library at the University of Pittsburgh, The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, and The Friends' Historical Library at Swarthmore College.

The format of the book is attractive and excellent in all respects. Professor Gipson's entries are precise and informative, frequently supported by citations to publications which afford additional information. The volume is well indexed. Most appropriate, too, is his dedication of this work to W. Deming Lewis, President of Lehigh University, for Lehigh has been the scene of his efforts since 1924. The University is to be congratulated for its support of the historian's historian par excellence.

The gratitude of scholars should be unanimous for Lawrence Henry Gipson's Guide must be the vade mecum of all who work within the scope it provides for Anglo-American history.

Eleutherian Mills Historical Library

JOHN B. RIGGS

This volume, written by two accomplished historians, is not a scholarly product designed for other experts in colonial history. Rather, it is intended as a supplementary readings book in college-level American history survey courses. As a result there is nothing new or startling in the way of interpretation nor is there any evidence the authors sought out new manuscript sources. The purpose was simply to synthesize the vast amounts of literature on colonial history into a brief, readable volume that would be a useful supplement in the classroom.

Goodman and Gatell divide their work into five broad topics: European expansion, early settlements, economic development, politics, and society. Each section reflects the best of recent research but suffers from compression. The authors try to crowd so much material into their twenty-page chapters that many important ideas are not satisfactorily developed. They would have done better to restrict further the scope of their topics. Interspersed between chapters are extended passages from primary sources such as Bradford's History of Plymouth Plantation and Burnaby's Travels Through the Middle Settlements in North America, 1759-1760. While interesting, these selections are not particularly well integrated with the rest of the book.

The American Colonial Experience is neither fish nor fowl. It is not a piece of original scholarship, an interpretive essay, a bibliographical note, or a selected readings book. Colonial historians will find little of interest in it, and many teachers will be dubious about its usefulness as assigned reading.

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee


This book surveys Quaker participation in the government of colonial Pennsylvania with particular emphasis on the 1750s when pacifism became a paramount issue. After war broke out in 1755, Quaker pacifists were blamed by their political enemies for frustrating every effort for the defense of the colony. This was denied by political leaders such as Isaac Norris who rightly declared that the Proprietary issue and not pacifism was the real reason for Pennsylvania's failure to meet the needs of defense. Quaker pacifists, in fact, did not control the Assembly at the time. Even earlier when they had control, Quakers had found it expedient to vote money for defense by the subterfuge of appropriating funds for the Crown which the Governor could spend for defense.

In 1756, after Pennsylvania declared war on the Indians and offered a bounty on scalps, Quaker conscience was aroused to the point where it felt obliged to do all in its power to end the war and restore good relations
with the natives. The Quaker efforts were productive in quieting some of
the Indians but it aroused bitter hatred among non-Quakers, especially
on the frontier where it was believed Friends were motivated by self-interest
and had no sympathy for the plight of the frontier people.

During the agitation over pacifism, the strict Friends in the Assembly
resigned and did not stand for reelection. If this had not been done
Quakers probably would have been barred from holding office during
time of war by action of the British government. Indeed, never before
had Quakerism in Pennsylvania been so severely criticized. Deeply moved,
many Friends attributed their distress to the fact that much worldliness
had penetrated the Society of Friends since its founding. “If they ob-
served the code of simplicity in dress and demeanor at all,” writes Mr.
Bauman, “they did so in a formal manner, impelled more by tradition
and public opinion than by sincere conviction based on spiritual experi-
ence.” The soul searching among Friends during this crisis resulted in a
reform movement spearheaded by zealous advocates of returning to the
primitive purity of earlier times.

The reform movement, however, ran into difficulty during the Revo-
lution when the Society again came under fire for its failure to support the
Revolutionary movement. Before the Revolution ended the Society itself
was deeply split over the issues with many leaving the fold for more
congenial affiliations. Those who remained called upon all to rely solely
upon Divine protection and to withdraw as much as possible from worldly
concerns.

After the Revolution Quakers “restricted themselves to limited, non-
partisan issues which could protect the testimony and display it to good
advantage.” But by this time Pennsylvania was no longer a target for
Indian attacks and Quakers no longer were torn by the problems arising
from pacifism. Consequently they could devote their energies to non-
partisan humanitarian endeavors such as helping the Indians and cru-
sading against slavery.

In analyzing the role of the Quakers in eighteenth century Pennsylvania,
Mr. Bauman divides the leadership into three categories. There were the
“politicians” who did not allow the doctrines of Quakerism to interfere
with their political activities. Secondly there were the “politiques” who
endeavored to adhere to Quaker principles but were not averse to using
influence and actions outside the legislature to further their ends. Lastly
there were the “reformers” who eschewed political action and insisted
that Friends could rely only upon Divine providence.

In his interpretation Mr. Bauman endeavors to use the theories of
sociologists and to see actions, especially those of the “politiques” in
terms of “role conflict.” The development of these concepts, however,
meets with limited success. In the main, Mr. Bauman happily sticks to
the history of the times and although there is little that is new to his-
torians, as a concise treatment of the political role of Pennsylvania Quakers
the book justifies its publication.

Rutgers University

THEODORE THAYER
"This is a book about American education," claims John Calam, "not just the daily routines of schoolmasters, but likewise the application of preachers, catechists, administrators, bibliophiles, and authors to the task of extending Church and empire unanimity in America." He concludes that "after eighty years of systematic educational exertion in America's thirteen colonies, S. P. G. effectiveness in stemming the republican tide proved negligible in comparison with initial society expectations." Drawing on the surviving records of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, on sermons preached and journals kept by its personnel, as well as the large body of secondary literature on the subject, Calam presents a story of the failure caused by factors more numerous and complex than the single, simple expectations of "stemming the republican tide."

Indeed, the initial aims of the Society, according to its charter of 1701, were not political but religious, anti-Catholic in fact, though it soon became obvious that all varieties of dissent from the Church of England were deemed reprehensible—hardly a popular position in the colonies. Society officials never did understand the New World; their "image of a stubborn, unyielding, essentially inferior America was to drain three-quarters of a century of S. P. G. educational energy." This posture toward the English colonists was no more mistaken than the attempts at proselytizing among Negroes and Indians while viewing the latter as a nation to be diplomatically negotiated with and the former as potential Christians whose status could not be disturbed by conversion.

The source of this wrong-headedness may be seen in the observation that the origin of the S. P. G. was not in American conditions but the apparent pervasiveness of immorality in England. Numerous reformist societies were created to combat this supposed social decay, and some—notably the S. P. G.—were extended to America. But mother country and colonies were two quite different societies, the first static and the second dynamic. (Here Calam relies on Daniel J. Boorstin's thesis.) As the rate of change accelerated in eighteenth-century America, the Society only stiffened its initial aims.

The parsons and pedagogues sent to or recruited in the New World were of little help and sometimes of much harm in adapting London's goals to the provinces. Conditions were not encouraging. John Urmston described the churches in North Carolina: "all the Hoggs and Cattle flee thither for shade in the Summer and Warmth in the Winter, the first dig Holes and Bury themselves these with the rest make it a loathsome place. . . ." But a more serious obstacle to success was the personality of the proselytizer. George Keith, who in 1702 began a two-and-a-half-year inspection tour of the colonies for the S. P. G., was a Quaker apostate and constitutional trouble-maker whose low opinion of rustic America had been formed during his residency in New Jersey and Pennsylvania a decade
earlier. Urmston, who saw in the Carolina assembly "a strange mixture of men in various opinions, and Inclinations, often Church men, many Presbyterians, Independents, but most Anythigarians," recalled the civil war and saw "Oliver's days came again." The S. P. G. was supporting men who thought civilization was at stake in America.

Although Calam describes the careers of several S. P. G. servants, he is not concerned with their motives. Despite the title *Parsons and Pedagogues*, his approach is institutional rather than personal. One is left wondering whether Dr. Thomas Bray, founder of the S. P. G., and his cohorts did not feel that their most cherished values were in jeopardy. It is probably true that eighteenth-century England was a land where (Calam paraphrasing Boorstin) "security came from the assurance of living in a network of familiar and predictable relationships," but some men—the S. P. G. apostles among them—thought this system was collapsing. They sought to shore it up through a return to time-honored institutions: the authority of the Crown, the universality of the Church and, in the colonies, the dominance of the Empire.

But English Americans, facing the novelty of the wilderness, were also anxious—as provincial revolts and witch trials indicated—and they, too, looked to the past for security. They asserted their cultural superiority over Negroes and Indians, and consequently they rejected religious conversion and diplomatic negotiations as gestures which might endow the barbarians with civilized qualities. Politically, the Americans took their values from the Whigs or left-wing radicals, not from the Tories who inspired the S. P. G. Thus, *The S. P. G. Adventure in American Education* cannot be a book about education since neither the Society nor the Americans learned anything from the venture. Indeed, their divergent views of the world accentuated the conflict between mother country and colonies. The S. P. G.'s well-intentioned but self-serving endeavor was a missionary effort which fostered war.

San Francisco State College

Joseph E. Illick


In what he describes as "an experiment in the writing of comparative social and intellectual history," Professor John Harrison of the University of Wisconsin has attempted to place the Owenite movement within the cultural context of two contemporaneous but very different societies: the England of the early Industrial Revolution and the United States of the agrarian frontier. He has produced a book that can serve as a model for other scholars. In addition, his "experiment" has the very considerable merit of being written in a clear, smooth prose that makes the book a pleasure to read.

The author is not primarily interested in tracing either the career of Owen himself or that of his most famous project, the community of New
Harmony, two topics that have been thoroughly treated in other books. His primary interest is instead in the “culture” of the era, broadly understood to include the social, economic, and religious ideas upon which Owen and the Owenites drew as they moved from project to project in their attempt to accomplish the total regeneration of society. The Owenites called their system “social science,” but Harrison shows that it was in fact the adaptation of ideas drawn not only from sources like the Scottish Enlightenment and the eighteenth-century philanthropic tradition, but also from pseudo-sciences like phrenology and spiritualism and above all from religious sectarianism.

This is perhaps the most surprising conclusion of the book, but it is one that Harrison demonstrates persuasively. He argues that the success of Owenism, especially in England, can be understood in part by the fact that it represented for many artisans and factory workers a sort of godless substitute for the Methodist chapel. Owenism was a sect, and its doctrines were asserted with the tenacity of dogma.

The author writes that “in order to communicate the reformer has to employ the language of his age.” The early nineteenth century was an age in which millenarianism was unusually strong, and therefore a movement like Owen’s that sought to attract a mass public spoke the language of the Millennium. Owen first proclaimed the dawn of the Millennium in 1817, and from that time to the end of his long life he continued to believe that the new age of peace and plenty was just around the corner. Millenarianism (which Harrison rather confusingly calls “millennialism” much of the time) has been receiving increasing attention from historians over the past decade, and Harrison is especially good at showing that far from being simply a movement for either paranoids or for oppressed proletarians, it was a perfectly respectable part of the intellectual tradition in both Great Britain and America.

Millenarianism also constituted an important element in the communitarian tradition from which New Harmony and the other Owenite communities derived. Harrison very rightly points out that it is not particularly useful to dismiss these twenty-three social experiments as “failures.” In the first place, the Owenites themselves did not see them as failures. They might revise their plans somewhat the next time, but their conviction of the rightness of their principles and in the possibility of establishing planned communities that could be the models for the transformation of capitalist society was unshaken. In the second place, many of the frontier communities in the United States served the very useful function of easing the difficulties of the settlers’ establishing themselves in the wilderness.

In both Great Britain and the United States the Owenites placed great emphasis on the importance of education; as soon as the masses were taught to think rationally and scientifically, Owen’s “new moral world” could be accomplished. Owen’s educational ideas, which he derived from eighteenth-century educational theorists like Pestalozzi, were tried out in the communities, but in Great Britain they also constituted an important part of Owen’s efforts to capture the working-class movement through
the foundation of the producer and consumer cooperatives, Halls of Science, and Labour Exchanges of the 1830s. Here again it is meaningless to dismiss Owen's efforts as failures, since they did represent an important part of the "mental climate" that shaped working-class movements throughout the century. Harrison does not fully accept E. P. Thompson's thesis in The Making of the English Working Class that a Marxian class consciousness was coming into existence in the 1820-1840 period. He implies that Owen's belief in the possibility of a union of "all classes of all nations" was not quite so pathetic and unrealistic as Thompson would have it.

In the final section of the book, "The Owenite Legacy," Harrison certainly makes no inflated claims for his subject. Owen and the Owenites were forgotten after 1850. An age whose tutors were Darwin, Spencer, and (perhaps) Marx, he argues, regarded Owenism not as a legacy but as a relic. Possibly so, but surely a movement that brought together so many of the cultural currents of its age under one umbrella and that demonstrated so clearly the existence of an Atlantic community of interests and concerns deserves more studies of this kind. The suggestion contained in Harrison's useful footnotes and in his exhaustive bibliography of printed and manuscript materials on Owenism should keep scholars busy for a long time.

Dickinson College

CLARKE W. GARRETT


Richard Ellis' monograph is an informative and intelligent work. In it he examines the interaction of political and judicial questions during Jefferson's first presidential term. His analysis extends beyond the dramatic federal cases of this period—such as Marbury v. Madison or the trial of Justice Samuel Chase—to a discussion of related events in the states. Ellis brings both state and federal aspects into focus upon his central theme: the nature of judicial power was the overriding domestic political issue of the first half-decade of the nineteenth century. And this issue, he notes, was inextricably related to the evolving ideological disputes between Republicans and Federalists as well as developing differences within the Republican coalition itself. It was the matter of judicial authority, argues Ellis, that was used to resolve the basic question left from the Revolution and the constitutional settlement of 1789. At issue was whether the more democratic surge of revolution or the conservative concern to protect people from their own worst instincts would prevail.

It, of course, comes as no surprise to any reader of de Tocqueville that in America legal and political questions would be intricately intermingled. We are a passionately political and legalistic people. So it is to be expected that the Jeffersonians would also find it impossible to separate constitutional and judicial from political issues. Many Republicans were willing to take positions on the judiciary calculated to win over moderate Federalists to the Jeffersonian consensus. Others were more concerned with manipu-
lating the issue of judicial reform in such a way as to dampen destructive intramural differences appearing within their own party's ranks.

While he devotes considerable space to the Republican-Federalist maneuvering, Ellis' more original contribution is his examination of factional disagreements within the Jeffersonian coalition. The ideologies upon which he focuses are symbolized by John Randolph, with his deep fear of all concentrated governmental power, and James Madison, with his belief that stronger institutions were essential to any ordered society. Their political differences reflected a party-wide split between agrarian-minded radicals, on the one hand, and cautious commercially-oriented conciliators on the other. In congressional debates over the repeal of the Judiciary Act of 1801, in legal arguments over the mandamus suit for the "midnight judges'" commissions, in the impeachment trials of Judge Pickering and Justice Chase, each side sharpened its point of view. The radicals would democratize the judiciary making it more politically responsible. The Madisonian wing supported a stronger and more elitist role for the courts (so long as the judges were not merely Federalist partisans).

Ellis finds similar ideological disputes in state political contests. Here again the substantive issue was the power and organization of the judiciary. In Pennsylvania, for example, the radicals demanded judges more immediately amenable to popular control. The moderates, while conceding a need for some legal reforms, staunchly fought to preserve judicial professionalism and independence. In the Commonwealth the issue was debated in bitter electoral contests, such as the gubernatorial fight of 1805. In Pennsylvania the final victory went to the moderates. The story in Kentucky and Massachusetts—and on the federal scene—was generally the same.

It may be somewhat misleading to separate judicial issues from other political considerations such as economic or social. For anyone seeking a broad understanding of Jeffersonian politics, Ellis devotes too little attention to the interrelation and interaction of whole clusters of factors that illustrate the kaleidoscopic nature of the Jeffersonian political process. Still one should not quibble with the author's apparent decision that, in this case, the description of this complexity was overridden by a need for clarity of analysis.

This is an excellent book in that it reemphasizes the importance of legal/constitutional matters in the nation's political debates. It reminds us again that courts come to reflect the political winners' attitude. We need studies of this type where they are virtually non-existent as in the age of Jackson and in the Grant era; we need to supplement the too scanty examinations of the interaction of politics and the judiciary in the Progressive and New Deal periods. Certainly contemporary events such as demands for law and order continue to illustrate the complex interrelation of judicial power and partisan maneuver.

Having noted the merit of this book, I must register my personal annoyance with something I found in the introduction. Dr. Ellis is under the illusion that he has written an objective work untainted by "presentism." He puts it this way:
One of the best reasons I know for studying history is the need to keep the past inviolate. There exists a terrible tendency among people of all kinds of political persuasions to use what happened in the past to justify present-day actions. Sometimes this is done deliberately; more frequently, however, it is the inadvertent consequence of reading into the past the hopes, fears, and values of contemporary life.

This is especially true of those subjects which tend to be fashionable or which appear to have particular "relevance" to present-day problems.

This may be nothing more than an argument for irrelevant history—for scholarship that provides an antiquarian romp through yesterday—severing the umbilical cord between the present and the past. But it may also be an assertion by Ellis that the historian must purge himself of all conscious bias before he takes pen in hand. Apparently Ellis, in spite of his acknowledged identification with the Progressive School of historians, believes that he has produced such a hygienic work. His belief that the scholar can exorcise subjectivity and presentism, however, is arrogant and intellectually dishonest. It claims a good deal more than this author (any author) can deliver. Unfortunately, such historicism is manifested in all too much of today's historical writing. It ignores the real limits of the historian's craft. The historian is closer to the shaman than to the scientist. He does more than "discover" the facts of the past; he also applies his personal sense of logic to order them, to select the relevant, to discard the insignificant. This process of ordering and selecting must be subjective. Operating from within his own spatial and temporal environment, he assumes the propriety of certain orthodoxies: logic, perception, relationship. It is disappointing to find an historian as capable as Ellis engaging himself and his readers in the self-deception that he is producing an "inviolate" book uncolored by present-day concerns.

The Pennsylvania State University


Some election campaigns in American history have had a significance far beyond their immediate concern of choosing officeholders. Some elections, it may be said, represent a pivotal point at which the nation ended one phase of its history and entered a new era. The election of 1848 marks one of those turning points in American history. As Professor Rayback argues, the 1848 campaign terminated the Age of Jackson and launched the nation into the era of sectional strife that resulted in the Civil War. It was, of course, David Wilmot's proposal that slavery be prohibited from any territory acquired from Mexico that sheared the fabric of political consensus and injected the new and volatile issue of slavery into the political rhetoric of 1848. The significance of the 1848 election has been
generally conceded but no historian heretofore has traced the impact of
the Wilmot Proviso and the free-soil issue on party organization as the
politicians prepared for the campaign.

Prior to 1848 politicians were able to avoid the slavery issue by saying
it was the South’s problem, but the Wilmot Proviso introduced a tangible
problem, the extension of slavery into the West, with which all parties
eventually had to contend. Politicians who had become antislavery in atti-
dtude now were inspired to take a stand against the extension of the
“peculiar institution.” They believed that 1848 was their year of decision
and intended to write an anti-extensionist plank in their party’s platform.

The Free Soil commitment proved troublesome to the Democratic
party in New York where it struck some sparks in the smoldering feud
between the liberal Barnburner and conservative Hunker factions. The
Barnburners championed the Wilmot Proviso while the Hunkers feared the
issue would wreck party unity and their dominance over the state organi-
zation. The difference between these factions resulted in a breach that
weakened the Democratic party in New York and encouraged many Barn-
burners to search for a new political home. Similarly in New Hampshire,
Massachusetts and Ohio other Democrats assumed a free soil position
thereby threatening to drive a wedge into the party’s national consensus.

The northern Whigs who included a sizable antislavery element also
found the debate over the extension of slavery cutting to the core of the
party. In Massachusetts the antislavery Conscience Whigs clashed with
the Cotton Whigs. The Conscience Whigs adopted the free soil argument
while the Cotton Whigs, like the Hunker Democrats, warned that the issue
threatened the national Whig party and the Union. In New York a rift
appeared among Whigs as the powerful Weed-Seward-Greeley faction
flirted with free soil sentiments, and in the Midwest other Whig organi-
zations became colored by their free soil views.

Even the antislavery Liberty party was not left untouched by the Wilmot
Proviso. That party’s failure to attract converts led many members, espe-
cially Ohio’s Salmon P. Chase, to contemplate a reorganization of the
party to include anti-extensionists. Such a reorganization implied an aban-
donment of pure abolitionism but Chase and others were willing to moder-
ate their aims for more practical and realizable goals. As in the major
parties the anti-extensionists of the Liberty party met resistance from the
old-timers who wanted to maintain the inviolability of their party.

The Wilmot Proviso, thus, became the Banquo ghost in the pre-election
preparations and increasingly politicians were aware of its presence. As
with most politicians the Whig and Democratic managers sought a candi-
date who would cause the ghost to disappear. The Democrats believed
Lewis Cass’ concept of popular sovereignty offered the sensible resolution
of the issue and they nominated him. The Whigs, more anxious to find a
winner than offer solutions to complex problems, turned to Zachary Taylor,
war hero and slaveholder. Both nominations frustrated the anti-extensionists
because neither of the candidates or parties was committed to restricting
the spread of slavery. Consequently the anti-extensionists, drawn from the
Rayback acknowledges that the campaign involved many issues but the central one was the extension of slavery, an issue which was to plague American politics for the next twelve years. In 1848 party loyalty among Whigs and Democrats was sufficient to overcome the slavery issue though each party was weakened by the issue. Contrary to conventional interpretations Rayback has shown that the Democrats, not the Whigs, contributed most to the Free Soil votes. He estimates that fifty-eight percent of the Free Soil vote came from the Democrats, twenty-two percent from the Whigs and twenty percent from the Liberty party.

The author has canvassed the party organizations meticulously and revealed how fragile the political system had become by 1848. Especially refreshing is the nature of the research. The book represents a return to the traditional sources of political history. The author has not slighted the quantitative approach but his work is based primarily upon a thorough combing of manuscripts and newspapers. Maps of the election returns serve as useful end pieces.

Perhaps the only question which Rayback failed to answer satisfactorily concerns Martin Van Buren. In the 1820s Van Buren was a principal architect of the Democratic party by welding together the New York-Virginia axis. One would have expected him to become "soft" on slavery in deference to his southern associates. Yet he became the Free Soil candidate in 1848. This metamorphosis of the Red Fox of Kinderhook needs explaining.

Finally, one is tempted to compare Rayback's book with Theodore White's quadrennial studies of the last decade's presidential elections. White's books are superb contemporary accounts but they lack the depth of research and perspective which a historian like Rayback can bring to the subject. The journalist will obviously surpass the historian in readership and royalties but Rayback will have a consolation prize—the satisfaction of knowing that his book will stand as a definitive work while White's books will need revisions.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

W. Wayne Smith


In this perceptive and balanced biography, Richard E. Welch, Jr., traces the political career of George Frisbie Hoar, Massachusetts Senator, staunch Republican, and prominent figure in the anti-imperialist debate. In his late seventies when he died in 1904, Hoar had pursued a public life that began with his first election to office in 1852, spanned the inception of the Republican party, the Civil War, Reconstruction, and the critical years of the late nineteenth century, and ended during the beginnings of the Progressive movement. Four terms in the House of Representatives and nearly three decades of service in the United States Senate, during which he observed or participated in many of the period's significant events, make
Hoar worthy of the detailed and understanding treatment he has received in this biography. "George Frisbie Hoar spent his entire adult life in an effort to be true to his God, his party, and his ancestors," Welch concludes. "He died convinced that he had done his best by each, and probably he had."

Of these loyalties none was more important to Hoar than the Republican party. Familial influences and a hatred of slavery brought him to the party in the 1850s, and his dedication to it persisted through the following fifty years. It was, in his view, "the last child of freedom." It stood for social justice, represented economic development, and spoke for national progress. Against it, the negative outlook, racist attitude, and states rights doctrines of the Democracy offered no reasonable alternative. Circumstances sometimes strained Hoar's devotion to the party, but the devotion always remained, buttressed by the confident assurance that Republican ideals best suited the needs of the country. Hoar believed in the inseparability of party and principle under the American system of government. "When you separate yourself from the party whose principles and purposes are yours," he once remarked, "you effectually abandon those principles and purposes."

Acting in this belief, Hoar worked within the party to satisfy personal aspirations and fulfill legislative goals. He shunned the 1872 Liberal Republican movement, detested the Mugwumps who deserted the party in 1884, and supported William McKinley in 1900 even though he vehemently disagreed with the president's policy in the Philippines. Welch is critical of his subject in connection with the latter incident, arguing that Hoar's steadfast loyalty to the Republican organization helped frustrate his own aims and prevented the creation of a bipartisan opposition to McKinley's expansionist course. Instead, Hoar disdained cooperation with the Democrats, confined his anti-imperialist efforts to Republican ranks, and welcomed the re-election of his opponent and fellow Massachusetts Senator, Henry Cabot Lodge, in 1899.

But it is clear that Hoar's momentary weakness was the Republican party's continuing strength. For Hoar was no anachronism. Thousands of Republicans in the late nineteenth century shared his feelings toward the party, and in this respect Welch's study is particularly valuable. By detailing the outlook of one Republican, Welch contributes to an understanding of the party's ability to maintain a cohesive spirit that always eluded Democratic opponents. This spirit enabled Republicans to unify diverse followers in behalf of constructive programs, permitted them to govern effectively, and assisted the emergence of the Republican majority that would rule the nation for nearly three decades after 1894.

Welch skillfully blends coverage of outside events with analysis of Hoar himself. Extensive research and an excellent prose style add to a generally convincing account of a man who revered Charles Sumner and followed James G. Blaine, who sustained a lifelong concern for the cause of the freedmen, who balanced an interest in woman's suffrage and the rights of labor with disapproval of constitutional innovations such as the direct election of Senators, and who sought to reconcile a deep admiration for
the benefits of the new urban-industrial society with a distaste for some of its consequences. Welch properly rejects an interpretation that would make either Hoar or the Republican party a mindless puppet of the business community. Hoar’s espousal of a high tariff stemmed from personal conviction that protection meant advancement for New England and prosperity for all segments of society.

Welch also stresses the continuities between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, although he is perhaps too cautious in his suggestion that Hoar’s brand of Republicanism served “as a slender bridge between the interventionist tradition of a Whig past and a Progressive future.” The maturing Republican doctrines of the latter part of the century were neither slender nor, in many respects, tradition-bound. Guided by leaders like McKinley and Blaine, strengthened by the ideals and loyalty of men such as Hoar, Republicans reformulated issues and programs to meet new problems and address new constituencies. Their success was evident before Hoar’s death. In helping to explain that success, as well as in offering a thoughtful and persuasive biography of an important figure, Welch has made a significant contribution to the growing scholarly reevaluation of the Gilded Age.

Yale University

R. HAL WILLIAMS


This interesting book brings together eight essays on episodes in Theodore Roosevelt’s career that illustrate his propensity for combat and controversy. Thoroughly researched and written in a lively style, these investigations of minor Rooseveltian squabbles represent a useful addition to the voluminous literature on the presidential advocate of “the strenuous life.” It is especially gratifying to have reliable treatments of the quarrel over an artistic coinage, the open shop in the Government Printing Office, and the diplomatic indiscretions of Maria Storer.

Professor Gatewood also contributes three revealing explorations of Roosevelt’s difficult relationship with black citizens during his presidency. The chapter on the Booker T. Washington dinner underscores the intransigent attitude of white Americans toward Negro aspirations in this period, and brings out the obstacles that confronted even the most minimal assertion of black rights. At the same time, in the Indianola post office battle and the fight over the patronage ambitions of William D. Crum, Roosevelt revealed the fluctuating quality of his own commitment to racial justice. The author is very astute about the President’s sensitivity to the mood of the electorate on this question.

For all its assets, however, the book is in the end less than entirely satisfactory. An introductory essay on Roosevelt as “The Soul of Controversy” supplies some insights into the larger implications of these individual quarrels, but the author provides no analytic conclusion. As a result the book ends abruptly with the ramifications of its theme unexplored. This
may arise in part from Gatewood's ambivalence toward his subject. While the conventional homage is paid, there is also evidence of doubts. The author mentions "the relative meagreness" of Roosevelt's achievements, and notes his "equivocation on virtually all vital issues." Throughout the book runs a thread of skepticism about the impact of the President's eagerness for a public fight, and whether the results warranted the energy expended on these issues.

This is a more important point than Gatewood realizes. Roosevelt's relations with Congress, for instance, went from bad to disastrous in his second term, and episodes like the artistic coinage imbroglio and the Secret Service incident do much to explain why. The issue was larger than that of an allegedly conservative Congress against a progressive President. Roosevelt had an ever-expanding view of his power, and his regard for legislative sensibilities was proportionately diminishing. His willingness to circumvent Capitol Hill, his evasion of the letter and spirit of congressional intent, and his disparaging references to lawmakers did as much to poison the atmosphere as any differences over policy. After reading Gatewood's account of the Secret Service battle in the winter of 1909, the historian can better understand why Congress greeted the appearance of William Howard Taft with heartfelt relief.

The Secret Service affair also prompts disturbing questions about the favorable scholarly verdict on Roosevelt's zeal for administrative reform and efficiency. In the area of law enforcement such activities embraced a systematic program of collecting criminal records, exchanging them with state agencies, and increasing the power of federal investigative bodies to conduct widespread surveillance of private citizens. For Roosevelt all this was in pursuit of justice, but, as a recent study of the Brownsville incident suggests, government operatives often brought in results tailored to fit executive predilections. When a senator observed that "What the boys like about Roosevelt is that he doesn't care a damn for the law," he identified a major theme of the President's administrative style.

Many scholars have examined the political history of the Roosevelt years. Their focus has primarily remained one of a virtuous reformer doing battle with dastardly foes. Gatewood's sound book does not escape this tradition. Its careful scholarship will, however, assist students who seek to reappraise Roosevelt's career with skepticism and detachment.

University of Texas at Austin

Lewis L. Gould


This splendid inventory elaborates upon the 1957 Guide to the Municipal Archives of the City and County of Philadelphia, which was a simple listing of titles, volumes, and dates. The key word in the title of this new book is "descriptive," for it is description that is emphasized here. The contents of the archives are divided under four major headings:
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County; City; Districts, Boroughs, and Townships; and Non-Municipal Records. Within each of these divisions, the records are grouped according to the agency of origin, with a few exceptions that are explained.

A brief historical sketch of the institutional history of each agency precedes descriptions of the individual records series. For instance, under Fairmount Park Commission it is noted that this agency was established by an 1867 statute. Its membership and responsibilities are cited as well as extensions of its authority to 1951, when it was attached to the Department of Recreation.

The types of data in each records series are listed. Minutes, annual reports, and legislative journals normally have no further description, but special finding aids to these materials are planned for the future. The loose-leaf format of this volume permits the addition of other material if appropriate and may serve to prevent or delay obsolescence.

One of the interesting features of this book is the subject index, compiled by computer from the titles and descriptions of each records series. Examining the entry under “Maps,” one finds citations running alphabetically from “airfields” to “zoning,” and including such items as “land patents” and “map makers.” Under “Photographs” are citations ranging from “aerial” to “sewers”; under “Occupations” citations from “alcoholics” to “vehicle drivers,” and including “taxpayers.” Under the entry “Age of” are citations, numerous in most cases, for “Alms House inmates,” “apprentices,” and so on to “suicides” and “vagrants.” Obviously, innumerable opportunities exist here for quantitative studies in historical sources.

Cross-referencing adds to the usefulness of this inventory. For instance, the listing of records from the Court of General Sessions includes references to listings under the Court of Quarter Sessions and Oyer and Terminer and the Mayor’s Court or City Court. The index is similarly cross-referenced. A check of “Public house licenses” there leads the investigator to “Liquor licenses,” one of four separate citations under “Liquor”; and the investigator is invited to look also under “Alcoholism.”

Girard College and the Gas Works are cited in many entries. Less numerous citations, intriguing to this reviewer, are those to the Benjamin Franklin Legacy, the City Ice Boats, the Wills Hospital, a tobacco warehouse journal (1845-1856), a lamp and watch tax, and the files of “Submissions, 1911-1960,” to the Art Jury. Generally the oldest documents seem to be those listed under the county offices. The non-municipal records entries are few, the major collections of unpublished materials in this group being those related to the Centennial of 1876.

The computer-made subject index covers more than a hundred pages. A brief chronological index of only five pages lists records series after dates of major changes in the governmental organization of the city and the county. The major dates are 1701, when Penn chartered the city; 1789, when it was reincorporated by statute after the first city government had been dissolved during the Revolution; 1854, when the city and county were consolidated; and 1887, 1920, and 1952, dates when major reorganizations of the city government took effect.
Readers are advised that microfilming and other duplicating services are available for all holdings and are presented with a list of records already filmed which can be acquired quickly. Altogether this is a work of which Philadelphia can be proud, a model of how knowledge of public records can be made available to scholars.

University of Delaware

JOHN A. MUNROE

**Negroes and the Great Depression: The Problem of Economic Recovery.**

In this volume the author has added support to those historians who have written recently of the many limitations and lost opportunities of the New Deal. The book is a carefully documented and well-written account of the indifference of New Dealers and others to the underprivileged Negro in America. The terrible economic plight of Negroes on the farm and in the city called for special attention if they were to benefit significantly from the recovery program. However, administrators on both national and local levels, aware that blacks were weak and poorly organized and lacking in political power, were for the most part insensitive to their needs. By 1935 Negro leaders saw that the New Deal "had failed to improve significantly the economic condition of the black masses," and they attempted to organize a powerful interest group that white political leaders could no longer ignore.

The first two parts of the book deal primarily with the relationship between the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the National Recovery Administration and the Negro. Although it is a generally accepted view that the New Deal farm program favored the landowners and better-off farmers, Wolters describes how Negro tenants, sharecroppers, and wage laborers were affected even more adversely than their white counterparts. The administration of the various farm programs was controlled by local committees of white landlords and politicians prone to racial prejudice and much more sensitive to better organized farm groups and Southern Congressmen than to the needs of the Negro farm worker. Wolters does find that smaller New Deal agencies such as the Farm Security Administration were more sympathetic; however, few Negro tenants received loans from the FSA, and fewer than 2,000 Negro tenants were aided as thousands of tenants, black and white, were displaced during the 1930s.

Under the NRA Negroes fared little better because NRA codes were ignored or easily manipulated to discriminate against black workers. Many jobs in industry were designated as "occupational classifications" and as such were not covered by codes; Negroes filled most of these. The codes also included "geographical classifications" that allowed for lower minimum wages in the South, where many Negroes worked. The NRA's inadequate enforcement machinery enabled owners to ignore many codes which might have helped Negro workers. As overall prices increased due to New Deal
programs, the Negro continued to receive substandard wages. And there were few wage increases in areas not covered by the NRA such as agricultural and domestic workers, where Negroes worked in large numbers. At the same time, the employers' ignorance of the codes probably saved thousands of low-paying jobs for Negroes who would have been displaced by white workers if the codes had been more vigorously enforced. And Negro workers were probably better off that Section 7a of the NRA did not adequately protect unions or provide for stronger collective bargaining since many of these unions had histories of racial discrimination.

The third section of Wolters' excellent volume describes the debates within the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other Negro betterment societies as these groups struggled to find ways, means, and procedures for effecting a better life for Negroes. By 1935, convinced that New Deal rhetoric had not brought significant economic relief to the Negro, many members of the NAACP insisted that the old emphasis on education, publicity and legal rights had to be replaced by a greater emphasis on the economic plight of the Negro and by the adoption of more militant means to obtain economic justice. But plagued by financial problems, conflicts between dominant personalities, and a tradition of public relations and civil-liberation programs, the NAACP for the most part never concentrated on economic goals. One result has been that most Negroes have never participated significantly in the prosperity brought on by World War II and Cold War spending, perhaps because "the black community of the 1930s had neither the financial resources nor the internal cohesion, mass sophistication, and leaders with the ability and disposition to guide the race toward either effective self-help or working class solidarity."

By judicious use of many records in the National Archives, periodicals, the papers of the NAACP, and private collections, Wolters has produced an important contribution to the literature of the 1930s. His work also serves to inform students that, unfortunately, as in many eras of the American past, the New Deal served primarily those groups most powerfully organized to petition government for aid and favors.


With the publication of this slender volume Professor Carey has presented a useful introduction to the study of folk culture in Maryland. Heretofore students of Maryland folklore and folklife had to rely on the now somewhat out-of-date Folk-Lore from Maryland, published in 1925 but based upon collections made in 1899. Carey laments the fact that Maryland lags behind her near neighbors Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania in the collection, preservation, and transmission of oral folk culture and offers this study in the hope that it will promote interest in and support for similar efforts in Maryland.
In his useful introduction, the author maintains that “to understand a national culture, particularly in this country, it is wisest to begin by learning something about the smaller cultural complexes that make up the whole.” Thus Carey introduces his readers to the lore of such “grass roots” people as the Chesapeake Bay watermen, urban ethnic groups, mountain settlers of western Maryland, and small farmers of southern Maryland in the belief that such forays into what may be called cultural microcosm are a necessary prelude to an understanding of American culture.

Defining folk culture as encompassing both oral traditions and the concrete artifacts that a homogeneous folk group may produce, Dr. Carey presents a wide selection of “myths, legends, folktales, jokes, proverbs, riddles, chants, curses, oaths, tongue twisters, folk drama, folk belief and folk medicine, folksong, folk instrumental music, folk speech, children’s games, counting-out rhymes, and jump-robe rhymes.” In a short review it is not possible to give more than one or two examples of the folklore forms which constitute the bulk of the book.

Sprinkled throughout the book under the general heading of “Folk Belief” and under such sub-headings as “Love, Courtship, and Marriage,” “Death Beliefs,” and “Weather Beliefs” are epigrams such as “The number of white spots on your fingernails indicates the number of boyfriends you have.” “If your nose itches, a stranger is coming,” and “If a dog howls, it’s a sign of death.” These folk superstitions of course are not unique to Maryland and thus their inclusion in a study of Maryland folk culture seems somewhat pointless.

Of more value, especially to the historian, are the artifacts described which either relate uniquely to Maryland or at least are symbolic of some sub-culture represented in Maryland. Thus the descriptions and pictures of eel gig, eel pots, nippers (oyster tongs), and crab shanty are not only interesting and quaint, but informative. From these descriptions and pictures we can learn a great deal about how the Chesapeake Bay watermen made a living.

George Carey is especially well-equipped to write this survey of “pocket culture.” As Vice-Chairman of the Maryland Gubernatorial Folklife Commission and also, interestingly, Vice-President of the Pennsylvania Folklife Society, Dr. Carey is busily engaged in the collection, examination, preservation, and publication of both the “artifacts” and mentifacts” of what folklorists call material culture. In addition Carey, as an Associate Professor in the Department of English at the University of Maryland, is actively involved with the Maryland Folklore Archive at College Park.

In what is obviously a “labor of love,” Professor Carey has fulfilled admirably the need for a well-ordered, readable introduction to Maryland folk culture.