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Although it has some limitations, this case study of social and physical mobility is one of the best such volumes yet to appear. Its principal attribute is that it gives considerable emphasis to the processes of mobility and not just the magnitude of movements. The framework is not merely another test of the Alger myth, rather it places mobility in the larger context of urban-industrial change in the nineteenth century. The data analysis is based on the entire male population of Waltham, not just a sample. Gitelman also utilized payroll records from the two largest firms, providing an exceptional level of detail.

Gitelman examined the Waltham economy to evaluate the prospects for social mobility. He discovered that the two major employers provided markedly different opportunities. The Waltham Watch Company was a model firm, with relatively high wages, relatively short hours, and clean work. Most importantly, the work was so arranged that a man could enter at or near the bottom of the work force, increasingly gain skills, and eventually rise in both status and income. He could do this without changing jobs or craft. (This also highlights the limitations of census occupational classifications as the sole measure of social mobility.) Waltham's other large employer was the Boston Manufacturing Company, the pioneer textile factory begun in 1814. At that firm there were no low-high skill equivalents for the male work force. Waltham's Irish Catholic men tended to concentrate in the dead-end jobs at the textile mill while the more promising and higher status positions at Waltham Watch went almost entirely to native Protestants. It is not surprising that the Irish suffered discrimination in hiring practices, but we learn more here. Gitelman has made clearer than ever before the process which permitted native Protestants to maximize the advantages of that discrimination and to perpetuate their status.

Gitelman also argued that physical mobility was associated with a particular phase in a man's life cycle, although he never used that phrase. Young men, mainly single, were most likely to move into and out of town. Thus physical mobility emerges as a more predictable and understandable phenomenon. It was an integral part of the social and occupational mobility process; in fact, Gitelman implies that physical mobility may be an independent variable for explaining social mobility. This is only an hypothesis, but an important one.
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In examining social and occupational mobility among persisters Gitelman found considerable grounds for optimism, although he accepted generous definitions of what constituted social and economic advance. Among men who persisted at least twenty years, two-thirds improved their economic condition to some degree, and 64 percent became homeowners. Generally he found an association between persistence and asset holding at any given time, with the predominant form of asset holding being homeownership. This further reinforces the significance of the life cycle notion since home ownership itself is associated with a distinct phase of the cycle. Unfortunately, the author never explicitly makes that connection.

Gitelman does deal directly with the problem of how to treat outmigrants in the analysis. Some historians have suggested that outmigrants should be considered as occupationally immobile. This, of course, would considerably depress the rate of social advance. But Gitelman points out that both his out-migrants and his in-migrants, who outmigrated from somewhere else, had very similar characteristics in age, ethnicity, assets, and occupational levels. Therefore, he concludes, to examine a city's in-migrants is also to deal with the out-migrants, and we should stop bemoaning our inability to trace more than a fragment of outmigrants. Perhaps true, but Waltham is not an entirely satisfactory location from which to draw such conclusions.

One of Gitelman's major arguments is that Waltham lacked a class structure. Admitting a considerable degree of stratification at any given moment, he nevertheless argued that the open nature of the society from a physical perspective, and the social mobility achievements of the persisters, mean that no rigid class barriers existed to restrict mobility opportunities. He notes the absence of a permanent underclass and concludes, "The massive grinding poverty, the personal debasement, and the peril to life which have so often characterized industrialization were notably absent in Waltham" (p. 180). Two specific factors, however, would encourage the most hopeless and dispairing elements of the population to move on. First, the opportunities for casual, daily labor for marginal workers were limited. There were no docks, no freight yards, nor any massive street and sewer construction projects. Secondly, Waltham had a housing shortage throughout the late nineteenth century. Both major employers had to provide company housing. Thus an ample supply of cheap, deteriorated housing for an impoverished population did not exist in Waltham. But it could be found only ten miles east.

Although the author may deduce too much from his case study about the overall process of industrialization and its impact on social change, he has provided a valuable and highly readable volume, useful not only for mobility specialists but for other historians interested in developments in this vital area.

Lehigh University

ROGER D. SIMON

In recent years the Progressive Era has been studied from almost as many different approaches as Jacksonian Democracy. Now William L. Bowers explores still another aspect of it: the Country Life Movement. This was an unsuccessful attempt to halt the exodus to the cities, sparked by Theodore Roosevelt’s Commission on Country Life in 1908. Its proponents shared the traditional suspicion of the evils supposedly inherent in urban life, intensified by a racist fear of its immigrant make-up. They hoped that improving rural schools, churches, and roads, along with promoting extension education in agriculture, would make farm life more attractive.

In a competent but not particularly engrossing manner (the subject does not lend itself to lively prose) Mr. Bowers describes this campaign and shows the inherent contradiction in it. On the one hand it was an effort to make farming a more efficient business by encouraging new scientific methods, reflecting Progressivism’s emphasis on efficiency, scientific management, and the use of the social sciences. Yet at the same time it expressed a long standing sentimental nostalgia about the moral superiority of rural values that Richard Hofstadter has so well depicted as the Agrarian Myth of the yeoman farmer. Confusion resulted in trying simultaneously to apply new business techniques and still preserve old agrarian values without realizing that these two goals might be in conflict.

Presumably in a bow to the modern demand for quantitative data, an appendix lists some eighty-four leaders of the movement with their occupations; Mr. Bowers’ other findings on them, as on education and religion, reinforce Hofstadter’s and Mowry’s conclusions as to whom the Progressives were. Of these Liberty Hyde Bailey, director of Cornell University’s Agricultural College, who was to become the oldest active member of the American Philosophical Society until almost ninety-nine years of age, receives a chapter to himself as “the philosopher of country life” who combined both the romantic philosophic view, hostile to city life, urging farmers to grow more flowers, and to preserve the pure simplicity of their lives, and the scientific emphasis on agricultural education.

The chief criticism of the book is that too often Mr. Bowers does not tell us much that actually happened but merely summarizes what the leaders said about the subject in their correspondence or at conferences. But the fault is not so much with the author as with the crusade itself, which turned out to be more talk than accomplishment. He shows very clearly how these rural reformers, who sometimes were actually city dwellers and at best were ordinarily middle western, rural intellectuals, but in neither case dirt farmers, were always more romantic than realistic, best demonstrated by the failure of the farmers themselves to support them except in the drive for better roads. When the agitation was over, it had not reversed the drift to the cities; the pressures of modern industrial society could not be resisted. The topic is therefore only of marginal importance and does not cast as much fresh perspective on Progressivism as the author hoped.
The editors of this latest volume of the Wilson Papers promise the reader in their introduction that its contents will "reveal Wilson's rapid movement to a radical social democratic philosophy." His crusade for a "rebirth of democracy in academic communities" achieved through the means of "radical social reorganization" based on the "principle of non-exclusiveness" would soon be transferred to the political realm and find logical fulfillment in his future campaigns for governor of his state and president of his nation. But a careful reader of this volume may take issue with the words and phrases its editors have chosen to describe Wilson's supposed transition from academic democrat to political reformer. Indeed, one may very well question if Wilson at his most radical was ever radical at all, just as one may wonder at a principle of non-exclusiveness that continued to exclude. Perhaps it would be more reasonable to view Wilson as the evangelical manqué who, when he writes scathingly of the tariff make-believe of the Payne-Aldrich Bill, or intones an indictment of corporate concentration, more resembled what one auditor called "a noble preacher" delivering a powerful sermon. And the contents of that homily now that Augustine and Calvin were long since forgotten? That too bears consideration. For it will not be the glad tidings of the Social Gospel that this particular preacher delivers, but the grim news of a constitutional order that had been transformed into a Darwinian organism, and in which—true to his evangelical heritage—he would search for the individual hero who could evoke the heroism of individualism among his fellow citizens. Radical social democracy? Hardly that if those words have any meaning left in them.

His speech on Abraham Lincoln which the editors see as the point d'appui for his radicalism reads more like an apology for the führerprinzip discovered in the American scene: an atavistic invocation of chieftanship in the new industrial society. Wilson describes the ideal leader as one who had "his rootage deep in the experiences and the consciousness of the ordinary mass of his fellow men" but whose rootage was not holding him "at their level." One has visions of eagles' nests as Wilson's ideal leader soars "above the level of the rest of mankind" to an "outlook over their heads, seeing horizons which they are too submerged to see." No ordinary mortal here. And such an ideal leader possessed one essential attribute: an ability to "withdraw himself" to "see affairs as they are." Such men were hard to find in an urban society whose homogeneity Wilson thought uncongenial to them. Wilson had previously been reported as stating that Lincoln could not have been born in New York City and would have fought that city if he had lived until 1909. Now Wilson remarks that he meant no "disparagement" of America's major port of entry but simply stating the fact that the ideal democratic leader of which Lincoln was the model could not have been born in a "finished community" like New York. If he thought New York ever could complete its development, Wilson must never have penetrated to that city's greatness.
The leader, thus described, would welcome the current season of awakening, of moral and civil awakening that Wilson discerned in his later address to the civic league in St. Louis. Here he pronounced in the tones of the new orthodoxy that “this leadership of one leading person is the Darwinian process.” Its selectivity was accomplished as “the various organs of a government are being made either to assent or to dissent to some leading series of proposals.” This reduction of the political process from mechanical to the organic plane was “as inevitable as the law of nature.” Later in the year Wilson would speak at the McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago on the role of the ministry in industrial society. It was the same role as that prescribed for his ideal leaders mounting the tides of the new moral awakening. There was to be no immediate societal redemption. Instead preachers must find the individual to counteract his own first discipline. The law had not yet reached this maturity of purpose. So far law had only treated with “men in groups and companies” instead of punishing the real culprit: man alone. Wilson thought that no great age of accomplishment was achieved through “co-operative effort” but chiefly by “the initiative of the indomitable individual.” Rejuvenation would only come when “morals are a fresh and personal and individual thing for every man and woman in every community.” So much for the social side of Wilson’s radical democracy.

But was Wilson’s analysis at least social in its critique? Did it not reckon with the growth of private power in the new age of corporate gigantism? Here too it was rather limited and very short of what is usually denominated radical. Reacting to the passage of the Payne-Aldrich Bill, Wilson lashed out at its “system of patronage” which left “no longer a sense of individual enterprise, of small bodies of capital embarked upon a thousand undertakings.” Wilson decried an economic order in which “those who control the great masses of capital . . . have combined together and put at the head of every industry a dominating corporation, or group of corporations, with organization and resources which are irresistible by any competitor.” On one occasion Wilson petulantly personalized his distaste for this state of things. Invited to attend a bankers’ meeting in New York he at first refused because it would necessitate his meeting that cavalier knight of corporate America, Senator Nelson Aldrich of Rhode Island, who repelled Wilson more than any individual except Speaker Cannon.

But if Wilson was angry at the direction of economic trends so was much of the country. If Wilson utilized the anti-corporate rhetoric so had other Americans throughout his generation. The question crucial to the depth of Wilson’s radicalism was not his description of reality but what did he propose to do about the problems over which he expressed so much concern. Any writer could have made a condemnatory or comical indictment of the lobbying of business interests to gain advantage under the new tariff. But what did Wilson propose beyond searching for leaders somehow aware of the transcendent national interest in a season of individual awakening? True to his hitherto conservative views, Wilson would not destroy or injure “the dangerously indispensable instruments” that were the trusts. He would instead go after the “man behind the trust” dealing with him “personally and directly as with those who have borrowed the machines.
for their own unlawful use and run amuck." He was strongly averse to regulatory commissions which too much resembled "erecting the government itself into an all-dominating machine." The closest Wilson came to stating precisely what all this meant in terms of practical programs was his definition of the opportunity awaiting the Democratic Party as the interest in his possible gubernatorial candidacy began to grow. Interests once local and separate had now become unified and national. Such must be treated "upon a national scale, in a national spirit, and by the national Government." It was the task of the Democrats to exercise such control "not to increase the powers and temptations of those who administer government" but in such fashion that shall make "law supreme through judicial instrumentalities, by making it operate directly upon individuals, and emphasizing in every item of legislation the responsibility of individuals." A rather safe and sane approach that had already attracted conservative support for Wilson's presidential candidacy in 1908.

One also had difficulty with the editors' concept of non-exclusiveness as it appeared at Princeton. A number of Chinese students were to be educated in American universities with funds provided by the so-called Boxer Indemnity. Princeton was among the institutions it was thought would participate in the program. But its President described a closed-door policy that might leave an Oriental wondering how sincere Americans were about their diplomatic statements. Wilson wrote that "our present social organization at Princeton would be sure to result in making any Chinese students who might come here feel like outsiders, not received into the real life of the University but set apart for some reason of race or caste which would render them most uncomfortable." There was the perpetual question of application by black students for admission to Old Nassau. Such an individual was G. McArthur Sullivan—a Baptist from South Carolina. In a draft of his reply Wilson noted that "it is altogether inadvisable for a colored man to enter Princeton." The secretary of the university suggested the student apply to Brown instead because of its Baptist affiliation. There were difficulties for Wilson with other minorities. In a baccalaureate address the Princeton President had criticized labor unions for their alleged tendency to force conformity by allowing no member to work harder than the average. The speech naturally drew headlines in the New York Times: WOODROW WILSON HITS LABOR UNIONS. SAYS THEY GIVE LEAST POSSIBLE WAGES! Edgar R. Laverty, a member of the typographers union, challenged Wilson to provide precise data for his charges. Another union member attacked him for the news report. The words proved to cause Wilson no end of worry. As he wrote the quondam Mrs. Peck about suggestions that he run for governor, he remarked that the particular "passage about the trade unions" would make the "politicians who control such matters very shy of me." He continued that he had "the labor papers hotly after me." But there remained the consolation that "our gardener has been championing me against the workmen hereabout." Wilson was not the last academic to base his economic analysis on relations with his domestic servants.

University of Connecticut  
VINCENT A. CARRAFIELLO
In initial academic assessments of the Eisenhower presidency portrayed, the period as one of drift, stagnation, and complacency. Several historians writing in the warm afterglow of Camelot depicted Eisenhower as old, indecisive, unenergetic, and inarticulate in comparison with the youthful, incisive, vigorous, and eloquent John Kennedy. The unsuccessful American adventure in Vietnam and abuses of power by a presidency overgrown to imperial proportions have, however, prompted reconsideration of the Eisenhower caution and restraint. Several recent studies, such as Gary Wills' *Nixon Agonistes* and Herbert Parmet's *Eisenhower and the American Crusades*, take the revisionist line that Eisenhower in office displayed more good will and shrewd common sense than any of his three immediate successors.

Alexander sides with the revisionists in his study of the Eisenhower presidency. More sophisticated than some current writers who nostalgically interpret the 1950s as a time free from tension, turmoil, and crisis, Alexander repeatedly acknowledges Eisenhower's shortcomings, such as Ike's failure to actively oppose the destructive policies of Joseph McCarthy, his lack of expressed sympathy with the civil rights movement, and Eisenhower's inability to prevent a flagging of the national spirit during his last years in office. Nevertheless, Alexander argues that the substantial achievements of the Eisenhower administration far outweigh its deficiencies. Eisenhower ended a war in Korea and prevented American involvement in others. He presided over a period of unparalleled peacetime prosperity. His eloquent farewell address wisely warned the nation against "public policy . . . (becoming) the captive of a scientific-technological elite," "the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow," and "the recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to current difficulties."

Alexander considers criticism that Eisenhower did not anticipate the major concerns of the 1960s, race and poverty, as spurious. American leaders are always bound by the realities of public expectations. Kennedy, for instance, never galvanized interest in energy or conservation, the major concerns of today. Alexander's thesis rests on unimpressive documentation. In fact his failure to footnote, except for a very few information footnotes, often leaves the reader in doubt as to the evidence relied upon for certain assumptions. Although many figures of the Eisenhower era, such as Robert Anderson, Ezra Taft Benson, Richard Nixon, and Milton Eisenhower, remain active and alert, no mention of interviews appears in Alexander's bibliographic essay. Furthermore, Alexander did not even travel to Abilene, Kansas, to consult the manuscript resources of the Eisenhower Library. Alexander evidently read widely in contemporary newspapers and magazines, government documents, and Eisenhower's published papers, but he relies far too heavily on secondary works. Alexander's neglect of much available primary data weakens his authenticity.
Holding the Line, except for one over ambitious chapter that rapidly and cursorily surveys economic, social, intellectual, and cultural phenomenon of the 1950s, utilizes a strict chronological organization. Such an approach leads Alexander into two traps, narration often unilluminated by sophisticated analysis and comprehensiveness at the expense of emphasizing the significant. By following a chronological outline so religiously, some of Alexander's least effective chapters resemble a month by month compilation of events more than a thoughtful assessment. A topical organization — a chapter on Eisenhower's relations with Congress, another dealing with Ike's advisors, for instance — might have fostered greater insight. Obsession with chronology also forces Alexander into taking note of nearly every Eisenhower movement, no matter how insignificant. By giving space to the peripheral and mundane, Alexander's balance becomes askew as momentous events receive inadequate attention. Alexander, for instance, devotes approximately equal space to Jack Warner's decision not to mention television in movies made during the early 1950s and Ike's choice of Nixon as a running mate in 1952.

Alexander writes lucidly and accurately, and his judgments are reasonable. Undergraduates may well find Holding the Line a useful introduction to the Eisenhower era. It offers nothing new or revealing, however, for specialists in the field. For the general public, Holding the Line lacks the wit, vividness, or provocativeness of Eric Goldman's The Crucial Decade and After. Alexander presents a competent, if uninspired, synthesis of previously published material on the era.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

WILLIAM M. SIMONS


This is a big book. It contains twenty-one essays, the result of a conference, "An International Comparison of Systems of Slavery," held at the University of Rochester on March 9–11, 1972, and sponsored by the Historical Advisory Committee of the Mathematical Social Science Board. The book is expensively priced. And without question, it has considerable scholarly importance (although one need not agree that it is as important as the editors claim.) The editors, Engerman and Genovese, are well-known scholars in the field of slavery. The footnotes from the various essays alone provide the uninitiated scholar with an excellent working bibliography of published and unpublished work on race and slavery in the Western Hemisphere.

The book's stated purposes are first, to advance the cause of comparative studies, second, to demonstrate the use of new analytical techniques, especially statistical, in advancing the cause, and third, to point to the existence of large amounts of raw data available for purposes of quantification. According to Engerman, in his excellent summary review of the book's essays, new materials and techniques permit better analyses of large bodies of data, hitherto not effectively used, so as to give a fuller picture of slave societies "and also to describe and understand the slaves themselves." Slavery
becomes, then, a subject or problem area where new scholarly techniques and new approaches will in Genovese's view hopefully raise scholarship "to higher levels of general significance" and show how scholars from different disciplines and specialties can blend their work to attack the big historical questions. One judges that the important problems are largely those in which the moral side of slavery is allowed little play and which concern themselves not so much with whether or not slavery was profitable to the slave-owner but with how much, or better how little, profit he was able to extract from it. Presumably, we've gone beyond such non-productive considerations. Lest anyone be frightened away from the book by the notion that it is filled with some "cliometrician's" bag of tricks, I hasten to add that most of the essays employ simpler statistical methods and in some cases hardly any at all.

The book is divided into five parts: the slave trade, the social-demographic aspects of African slaves and their descendants, a comparison of free and slave blacks in various Western Hemisphere cities, the post-emancipation situation, and a final section dealing in more general and summary fashion with interdisciplinarity and methodological problems. The variety of data, much of it far from new, being used in new ways is fascinating: ship clearance lists, tonnage lists, parliamentary papers, Dutch West India Company documents, Royal African Company living and dead lists, South Carolina treasury records, censuses of all kinds in English North America and in Latin America, and notarial records, to list but a few such sources. The new uses to which they are put are attempts at further clarification of many of the questions in the ongoing debates over American Negro slavery, dating at least as far back as the work of U.B. Phillips at the beginning of the century. The works of such older scholars as Eric Williams, Davidson, Pope-Henessey, DuBois, Curtin, Degler, Herskovits, Tannenbaum, Wade, Wesley, and Klein to name a few, are clearly the major objects of attack or modification. At times, however, the modifications reminded me of those "nit-picking" debates I was forced to read as a graduate student preparing for the field of Medieval English constitutional history for the Ph.D. examination, those seemingly endless thrusts and counterthrusts about the nature of parliament, the shire, the kingship, etc., which at the time I thought involved too many angels trying to dance on the head of the needle. Such seemed to characterize much of the section on the slave trade, with the essayists attempting largely through use of statistics to refine the debates over provenience, profitability, and mortality rates. Admittedly, I am simply not as interested in this area of Afro-American history as in others. Nonetheless, much of the discussion led me to wonder what might be the bases for the "big" questions.

At times, references to "assume," "estimate," "possible," and "probable," not only in the first part but elsewhere in the book hardly build up confidence in the strength of the argument. One author (not in the slave trade section) boldly declares: "None of the evidence presented in this essay is direct, all of it is circumstantial. However, the case provided by this circumstantial evidence is strong enough to conclude that many slaveowners in the American South systematically bred slaves for sale." This is not the kind of statement, hopefully, that would get very far in the courtroom.
Engerman takes strong exception, at least to the conclusions reached here, if not to the circumstantial nature of the evidence used in reaching them.

Those sections dealing with some social and demographic aspects of slave and free populations, the heart of the book, include several essays that raise some problems of an interesting comparative nature. Most readable are Wood's (whose book *Black Majority* is perhaps the best study yet of early British North American slavery) essay on slavery in early 18th century South Carolina; Craton's on Jamaican slavery; Bowser's on freemen and free-women in colonial Lima and Mexico City; Karasch's on slave mobility in early 19th century Rio de Janeiro; and Adamson's on plantation labor after emancipation in British Guiana during the last two-thirds of the 19th century. We are inevitably led to contrast the fate of urban blacks in several Western Hemisphere cities in the slave period; one interesting conclusion is that the migration of peoples from Europe in the 19th century adversely affected the position of blacks in places as far apart as Rio de Janeiro and Philadelphia. Adamson's paper clearly suggests comparisons with black-white relations in the post-Civil War American South. One might even be led to some rather futile speculation over what might have happened if North Americans had been more aware of the Guianan and West Indian experiences with emancipation earlier. Would things here have turned out differently? Probably not. Indeed, perhaps the post-war southern power brokers already knew as much as they needed to know of the earlier Caribbean experiences with emancipation to realize that if they wanted a dependable source of labor they would have to use all means available to control it.

I noted earlier Engerman's statement that quantitative studies puts us in "a better position . . . to describe and understand the slaves themselves." Elsewhere Engerman tells us that "the rather impersonal public records often provide the best means to study the social and cultural life of the slaves and of other lower classes." Such statements, of course, have almost become clichés. In any event, the book is a major disappointment in this regard. Several of the writers, notably Craton and Palmer, attempt to say something meaningful about black culture, but even they don't get very far. For example, Palmer, whose essay deals with religion and magic in Mexican slave society, hardly goes beyond the issues if not the format raised by Herskovits several decades ago. One might indeed discover more about plantation economy and the planter class using the public records. But as means of finding out more about the social and cultural life of the slaves they leave room for honest doubt. From this reviewer's perspective, Frederick Douglass' *Narrative* and more recently, Rosengarten's *All God's Dangers: The Life of Nate Shaw* are apt to tell us more about the social and cultural life of the slave and post-slave generations than all the quantitative studies that can be devised.

Obviously it is not simply a matter of documents. The problem is even more one of ethnocentricism, the imprisonment of the scholar in his own cultural values. In this connection I mention the astute remark made by Professor Shepperson in the book that "the tendency of some recent work has been almost to make the slave trade and slavery bear more heavily on the whites than on the Africans." The problem of cultural relativism is
admirably addressed by Sidney Mintz in his essay on the relationship of history and anthropology, to this reviewer's mind the most sensible and reflective piece in the book. Indeed, Mintz makes a profound statement when he comments that "the forced labor of Africans and their descendants was not so much a mere aspect of New World History in this region, as its essential nature." (Italics mine.) Shepperson raises still another big problem when he suggests the desirability of comparing the trans-Atlantic slave system with other slave systems different in time and place. When scholars start dealing with these kinds of problems, it seems to me that not only will they have gone a long way toward avoiding sterile debate but will have made large strides toward liberating themselves from destructive cultural impediments.

Notwithstanding that the book may not be all the editors crack it up to be, it is an important piece of work. It provides a clearer picture of where contemporary interdisciplinary and comparative studies are in the area of race and slavery in the Western Hemisphere. A good deal of what is depicted is worth the viewing.

Syracuse University

Othe M. Scruggs


An old cliche about American history, no doubt coined by a European historian, contends that "never has so much been written about so little by so many." Most Americanists would disdain such a comment, though a survey of the literature about the Civil War, the New Deal, and certain other areas might lead to a reassessment and a recognition that the cliche could contain more than a grain of truth. The increasing volume of material generated each year could cause one to speculate as to whether there are any new areas to plumb or if all that remains is reinterpretation and revisionism. Surprisingly, Burl Noggle has discovered an area which has received scant attention from historians. The machinations surrounding the Treaty of Versailles plus a few selected topics such as economic development and the Red Scare have been approached, but no one has ever undertaken a general history, a synthesis of the twenty-eight month period between the end of World War I and the inauguration of Warren Harding. Into the Twenties is essentially a narrative with every subject from aliens to the woman's movement discussed. The depth of treatment varies, however, and some may be disappointed to find their interest area glossed over. For example, an entire chapter, one of nine, is devoted to demobilization and the coverage is thorough. Converseley, the post-war shift in American society from a producer to consumer orientation is buried within one comprehensive and occasionally superficial chapter, "American Society, 1920." While the author admits to the unevenness of the coverage and begs the reader's indulgence (p. viii), I am not convinced that admission necessarily absolves him of a responsibility to his audience.

Interwoven with his narrative, Professor Noggle argues and sustains a very intriguing thesis. "The decade of the Twenties . . . began to take form in the
months after the Armistice. Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and their colleagues in governing the American economy and society of the Twenties were more caretakers than innovators; they took command in March, 1921, of a country already predisposed to move in the direction in which they chose to go. (p. viii) Such a thesis, of course, flies in the face of the old left historiography of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. and others who have viewed the Twenties as a temporary aberration, a reactionary Republican sponsored decade sandwiched between two progressive Democratic eras. The logical corollary of Professor Noggle's thesis is that the Twenties would not have been significantly different had James M. Cox and the Democrats retained power after 1920.

Professor Noggle has employed a vast array of primary and secondary sources. His use of manuscript materials, though all are drawn from the collection of the Library of Congress, is far more extensive than to be expected in a general history and the study is immeasurably enhanced. The only secondary account of consequence overlooked is John D. Hicks' Rehearsal for Disaster, The Boom and Collapse of 1919-1920 (Gainesville, Fla., 1961), a series of lectures at the University of Florida drawn from Hicks' research for the Republican Ascendancy, 1921-1933 (New York, 1960). The general analyses and conclusions of the two men are quite similar, a tribute to the quality of their scholarship, but they do differ on one salient point. In evaluating the relative role of government spending in postponing and mitigating the post-war depression, Noggle believes that it was less significant than did Hicks. It is a disagreement worthy of further exploration, especially since both men use basically the same evidence.

Overall, Into the Twenties is a sound and provocative book. Noggle's thesis, with its emphasis on continuity rather than change, should stir considerable useful debate about the nature of the Twenties.

St. John's University

LAWRENCE L. MURRAY


As Harold Cruse noted in The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual, the modern debate between black separatists and integrationists was foreshadowed by the differing viewpoints of two antebellum free black leaders Frederick Douglass and Martin Delaney. Cyrill E. Griffith's The African Dream: Martin R. Delaney and the Emergence of Pan-African Thought, tells the story of one of these nineteenth century Afro-American leaders, Martin R. Delaney, and his contribution to the early development of black nationalists in the United States.

The African Dream traces the career of Martin Delaney. Born in a society that strictly subordinated black persons, whether slave or nominally free, Delaney was one of a few Afro-Americans in the nineteenth century who managed to rise above their ascribed positions. A physician who briefly attended Harvard Medical School, Delaney was a co-editor of the North Star with Frederick Douglass, a writer, an organizer of an African emigration
movement, a Union Army Major, and a Reconstruction era politician in South Carolina.

Griffith focuses on Delaney the black nationalist and emigration advocate. Initially an abolitionist and a colleague of Frederick Douglass, Delaney began in the late 1840s to seek solutions that were more nationalistic than those of Douglass and the abolitionists. Delaney explored the possibilities of emigration to Central and South America and after rejecting these areas began exploring African possibilities.

Examining Delaney's activities in West Africa, Griffith details the negotiations that Delaney and his associate Robert Campbell had with the British government, the government of Liberia, and indigenous African leaders. Delaney, while abroad sought to convince the British government that an Afro-American presence in West Africa could be of commercial benefit to Britain. He also worked out agreements with African leaders, and mended fences with Liberian leaders whom he had previously attacked because of their dependence of colonizationists.

The Civil War changed Delaney's plans. Active in the effort to recruit black troops, Delaney towards the end of the war was granted a commission as a Major in the Union Army. Griffith follows Delaney's life in Reconstruction era South Carolina, his activities as a politician, his disillusionment with the Republican party, and subsequent support of the Democrats.

The latter part of The African Dream treats Delaney's accommodation to post-emancipation society, a society where the possibilities for emigration became increasingly dubious. Professor Griffith shows in this latter part how Delaney translated his nationalist ideology into his writings and political activities, including one post war emigration movement, The Liberia Exodus Association.

One flaw in The African Dream is that it does not give a very sophisticated treatment of Delaney as the central figure in the separatist-integrationist struggle of the nineteenth century. We see in Professor Griffith's book Douglass and the abolitionists characterized as moderates, and Delaney and the emigrationists termed radical. These appellations, unfortunately borrowed from the modern media, suggest that the root of this historical division among Afro-Americans has been temperamental rather than ideological. A better treatment of the antebellum conflict between Delaney and Douglass is needed.

The African Dream by Cyril E. Griffith is an important glimpse into Martin Delaney's life and influence on the early development of black nationalism in the United States. This book illuminates the varied worlds of Martin R. Delaney's significant career. Though Professor Griffith has injected a bit too much of our current mislabelling into his analysis of the antebellum Afro-American community's inner conflict, he has written a book that greatly aids in our understanding of a major shaper of Afro-American history.

Yale University and Connecticut College

ROBERT J. COTTROL

In this slender monograph, Professor Teaford describes the transformation in municipal government from the mid-seventeenth to the early nineteenth century, maintaining that the changes were so great as to constitute a revolution. In support of this thesis, he describes the structure and activities of the municipal corporation in seventeenth century England and the transplantation of the English model to the tiny towns that dotted the coastline and riverbanks in the American Colonies.

In Philadelphia and New York, Chester and Albany, as in Leicester and Liverpool, London and Lincoln, municipalities were commercial communities governed by merchants and artisans for the service of industry and trade. To that end, they restricted entry into various crafts, banned undesirable manufactures and settlers, fixed prices, established standards of weights and measures, and battled economic concentration and marketplace profiteering.

The exception of this congruence of Anglo-American urban rule was what Teaford calls “the Yankee Anomaly.” Eschewing the Old World pattern, the New Englanders “developed one institution to govern city and country alike”: the town. In thus rejecting the traditional autocratic rule of aldermen and councillors, the Yankees prefigured the innovative departure in municipal government that was to take place elsewhere, both in America and in England.

While asserting that the new form would not reach maturity until the nineteenth century, Teaford argues that a “revolution” in urban government was festering by the 1730s and 1740s. Underpinning the transformation were sharp changes in the “mental and material framework of Western life,” a new emphasis on political rights and on laissez-faire, an increase of population and an acceleration of economic growth. The great shift, Teaford believes, came with the American Revolution. Over the succeeding decades municipal government changed so markedly that by 1800 it bore slight resemblance to its colonial counterpart. Restrictions on the franchise virtually disappeared. Ordinances regulating prices and commercial activity vanished, and municipal authorities focused instead on matters like public health, safety, streets, waterworks, and city beautification. One remnant of the ancient polity remained: the right of aldermen and councillors to block repeal or renovation of the municipal charter. The removal of this impediment to democratic reform, “a second act in the American drama of municipal revolution,” was achieved by the extension of state authority over local government.

In sum, Professor Teaford argues that by the 1820s the autocratic structure of the closed municipal corporation had crumbled and on its ruins established a new (and essentially modern) pattern of urban rule, one based on “the principles of broad-based representative rule, adversary politics, and ascendant state power.”

The thesis is persuasive, even for the most part unexceptionable, but is it original? Teaford contends that it is, claiming that “no previous work has described the vital transformation” of urban rule “during the decades
from 1725 to 1825, a period of prime significance." If one grants the claim (and the present reviewer, who is not a specialist on urban history, must) then this monograph is a most important contribution to American urban history, one that is based on commendably industrious research in primary sources. Of another order are its four major defects: uncommon repetitiousness, that if deleted would have shrunk a short book yet more, a pedestrian organizational arrangement, and a seemingly random selection of illustrative data. To this reviewer, the latter considerations lead to a paradoxical conclusion: an important but a dull book.

Lafayette College


For intensive documentation of the Revolutionary War period, few Pennsylvania counties can equal Northampton. Beyond the usual resources for biography and genealogy, political and social history, such as are found in the courthouse, the graveyards and the churches, Northampton has three special treasures. A Committee of Inspection, Observation and Correspondence (among the local historians miscalled the Committee of Safety) functioned longer in Northampton than elsewhere, absorbing all political power during the interregnum of the years 1775, 1776, and 1777. The committee's minute book, possibly the only one extant in Pennsylvania, is preserved at Lafayette College. Northampton is also one of the few counties that possesses a virtually complete roster of those of its inhabitants who swore allegiance to the revolutionary state, as revealing for what it does not show as for what it shows. Finally, the Moravian Archives at Bethlehem embrace day-by-day documentation of the strains and tensions of the war that can scarcely be equaled anywhere else.

Where there is such an abundance of resources it is especially desirable to keep the sense of history alive. It is therefore greatly to the credit of the Northampton County Commissioners that they have given their financial support to an effort of the county historical society "to tell, under one cover, the stories of most significance and interest about the county's contribution to the American War of Independence." The author of the resulting volume, Dr. Richmond E. Myers, is a geologist and geographer who has contributed in the field of local history for many years. As the society's president, Mr. David H. Miller, points out, Dr. Myers writes "not for the professional historian" but rather for "the typical citizen of the county who wishes to learn something of what transpired in the area during the years of this country's birth." Dr. Myers writes moreover in the style of columns which he has contributed over the years to the Allentown Sunday Call-Chronicle. His illustrations are numerous and well chosen, his end papers are handsome and helpful maps covering the portion of present Lehigh and Northampton counties that had been settled by 1776. Although Dr. Myers's retelling implicitly points up the episodic character of what local historians have learned about the Revolution thus far, one cannot quarrel with this book's aim or the author's achievement.

Dickinson College

In 1972, officials of the Union League of Philadelphia sanctioned the writing of "an objective picture of the inner life" (p. xi) of their institution during its first century. Maxwell Whiteman, archivist and historian of the Union League, was assigned the task. Unfortunately, the product which emerged is a sympathetic, uncritical narrative history, devoid of any conceptual framework or well-defined thesis—except, perhaps, laudation of the Union League.

Founded late in 1862 by a group of distinguished local businessmen, the Union League of Philadelphia sought to counteract pro-Southern sympathy existing among the upper classes in the City of Brotherly Love. Pledging its loyalty to the Union and the Lincoln Administration, the League assumed such responsibilities as disseminating patriotic literature and raising nine military regiments. With the Civil War ended, the League remained in existence as a patriotic social and cultural organization.

Whiteman attempts to provide a corrective to erroneous assumptions held by some historians concerning the activities of the Union League in the South during Reconstruction. He endeavors to disassociate the Philadelphia organization from secret societies of the same name, which engaged in the recruitment of Negroes for the Republican party. Nevertheless, Whiteman's defense of the Philadelphia group tends to be somewhat ambiguous. At first, the Philadelphia League was not officially affiliated with the Republican Party. As the years passed, however, the League became inextricably linked with the GOP. Indeed, devotion to the Republican party became as much a criterion for membership in the League as did loyalty to the United States.

The Union League of Philadelphia is credited with playing a very influential role in both national and Pennsylvania politics, especially during the Gilded Age. For instance, it is suggested that the League was instrumental in securing Garfield's victory in the close presidential election of 1880. Ironically, the League withdrew from municipal politics in the 1870s, after suffering defeat at the hands of the local political machine.

As long as Republicans regularly occupied the White House, the League thrived. However, after Franklin Roosevelt's election in 1932, the organization tended to decline politically and socially. Eisenhower's victory in 1952 helped to rejuvenate the League. By the time of its centennial in 1962, the League had regained much of the prestige and vitality of former years.

Recently, historians have exhibited a renewed interest in "elites." Whiteman's study of the Union League falls into that genre. Previous commentators on the League, such as sociologist E. Digby Baltzell, are chided by Whiteman for making their observations from a vantage point outside of the organization. Conversely, Whiteman's perspective is formed excessively through the eyes of the League. Yet he never fully reveals the society's "inner life" to the extent that one might anticipate. For example, the reader is never told precisely who belonged to the League. We learn gradually that prominent businessmen predominated, but we get only occasional
clues as to the League’s exact socio-economic and ethno-cultural composition. In the appendix, Whiteman provides the roster and thumb-nail sketches of the founders of the Union Club, the immediate predecessor of the League. Obviously, the author could not include an annotated list of the entire membership of the League during its first one hundred years. A periodic collective biography would have been useful, however.

Considering the purpose and the audience for which this book was primarily written, perhaps it is unfair to judge it by the standards of the contemporary, social-science oriented, professional historian. On the other hand, many such historians will undoubtedly turn to its pages to gain insights into a significant upper-class club in the nation’s fourth largest city. Although diligently researched, Gentlemen in Crisis does not rise much above the level of antiquarianism.

Edinboro State College

CARROLYLE M. FRANK


The major theme of this volume is the suicidal course followed by Pennsylvania’s Democratic party in the decade just prior to the outbreak of the Civil War. As Professor Coleman notes, at the beginning of that period Pennsylvania was a Democratic stronghold, staunchly supporting the party’s presidential candidates and sending Democrats to Congress. In state politics, he adds, the Democracy was even more successful through “adroit party leadership, the adhesive of patronage, the disarray of the opposition, and, above all, the weight of tradition [which] kept Pennsylvania in the Democratic ranks.” By 1860, however, the party of Jefferson, Jackson, and James Buchanan had been “rent by faction, indicted for corruption . . . saddled with unpopular economic policies, accused of subordinating Pennsylvania interests to those of ‘The Slaveocracy,’ and widely represented as a haven for foreigners and Catholics.”

How did this happen? Coleman’s narrative offers us political history pure and simple, although the dramatis personae with which it deals were not necessarily pure and simple. It is in many respects a depressing tale of ambitious men contesting bitterly and greedily among themselves for political preferment. The protagonists always were ready to employ whatever Machiavellian means promised desired results. As a consequence, self-seeking aspirants for office frequently undermined party prospects and too often politics got in the way of statesmanship. Electoral campaigns, especially those on the state level, tended to revolve around personalities and few political personages emerged from the savage infighting with their reputations intact.

The principal antagonists here are James Buchanan and Simon Cameron, each of whom wielded a powerful if disruptive influence within their respective party organizations. Neither man has been kindly treated by conventional history and Coleman does not try to rehabilitate either man. The most he can say of them is that they were both able political tacticians. Buchanan, as the author makes clear, at length gained the presidency but
only after forfeiting much of the trust and loyalty of his political friends. Cameron's double-dealing course as a Democrat, led Buchanan in 1851 to describe him as "a stench in the nostrils of the honest Democracy throughout the State," and his later career as a Republican helped saddle Pennsylvania with a reputation for harboring corrupt politicians. Yet, while none of their contemporaries approached them in national stature, neither man could ever claim unchallenged title as spokesman for his party in the Keystone State.

Coleman does not overlook the influence of those controversial issues which Roy F. Nichols, in his *The Disruption of American Democracy*, has credited with reducing the Democratic party to virtual impotence by 1860. In this similarly titled study, Coleman deals with these issues as they affected Pennsylvania politics. He narrates the sad tale of the Whig demise, one which paved the way for the meteoric rise and later fall of Know Nothing nativism in Pennsylvania. He implies that it was only the strong traditional hold on the affections of the state's electorate that enabled the Democrats to withstand the disruptive machinations of Buchanan and Cameron and later John W. Forney. Of all the parties competing for Pennsylvania votes, perhaps only the Republicans took a moral stand. Even here, however, that party's anti-Nebraska position, as the outspoken Pittsburgh *Gazette* made clear in 1856, was based not so much on sympathy for the enslaved African as it was concern that "Free White Laborers of the North" might be excluded from the territories.

In the end, however, it was national issues that turned Pennsylvania voters from their long-standing support of the Democracy. The Panic of 1857 thrust economic issues to the fore and Buchanan's conservatism on this matter alienated many. By 1858, Coleman concludes, "a workingman's revolt against the Democratic party...combined with the debilitating effect of factional strife" ended the era of Democratic dominance in the state. While Coleman doubts that Democratic electoral defeats in Pennsylvania in 1858 represented a repudiation of Buchanan's Kansas policy, he recognizes that by 1860 the evident bankruptcy of that policy, coupled with general alarm at John Brown's raid on nearby Harpers Ferry, badly damaged the Democrats. Disclosures by the Covode Committee of Administration Corruption, Buchanan's veto of the Homestead Bill, and the Democratically controlled Senate's failure to accept tariff revision constituted fatal blows. The Democratic party split at Charleston in April 1860 was in the nature of a coup de grâce.

This is a well-written book and while it adds little that is new for students of the period it documents that which is familiar. It appears free of factual errors, although the reference to "Dred Scott v. Sanford" (p. 106) is a slip-up. Coleman's findings support the impression that in most respects Pennsylvania politics in the period in question represented a microcosm of those on the national scale.

Gettysburg College

Robert L. Bloom
Mrs. Allan Nevins is the source for a story that her husband was once showing two young women through their home. When they came to his study, the historian announced, “This is where I work.” He glanced at the uncompleted text in his typewriter and, as if drawn by demonic compulsion, Nevins fell to work, leaving the bewildered ladies to find their way back to the parlor. There are many Nevins stories. Most of them turn upon the style of his immensely productive career and most of them, Peter Gay assures us, have the virtue of being true.

Although he taught for nearly thirty years at Columbia and was, late in life, elected president of the American Historical Association, Nevins was never wholly within the mainstream of the profession. He had eschewed the ordinary path of professional advancement by way of the doctorate and pursued a successful career in journalism before moving into academic life, first at Cornell and then at Columbia. So prolific was he as a writer that there is no accurate record of his publications, but he is known to have written fifty books, edited about seventy-five more, and published over a thousand articles, essays, and reviews. If this productivity looked suspiciously “journalistic” to many of his colleagues, Nevins returned the disdain to “dry-as-dust” authors of monographs on obscure subjects. Indeed, if there was a single passion which compelled Nevins, it was to popularize the study of history. His understanding of the historian’s objective, according to Ray Billington, was to produce “an educated electorate, a cultured citizenry, and a nation that could build on experience as it progressed into the future.”

Four years after the death of Allan Nevins, Billington has edited this collection of thirty essays, about half of them appearing here for the first time in print. To the essays, the editor has appended an introductory appreciation of the life and work of his friend. Billington colorfully depicts the qualities that made Nevins a phenomenon: the dashes from subway to office or across the Huntington Library campus, the hoarding of books (who else would buy yet a third set of the _Official Records of the War of the Rebellion_?), the relentless promotion of his graduate students, the absent-minded eccentricities (apparently forgetting he had put on a tie one morning, Nevin arrived at work with a second one around his neck), and, above all, the compulsive productivity of the man.

This collection of essays, then, reflects the enthusiasm of their author: the popularization of history, the gathering and use of historical sources, the relation of history to other disciplines and assessments of prominent American historians of the past. These last, his analyses of Bancroft, Parkman, Rhodes and others will be of continued interest, but while several of the essays are good reading, many have the musty odor of stale argument about them. Nevins’ “Recent Progress of American Social History,” for example, originally appeared nearly fifty years ago. Given the development of that field in the meanwhile, such an essay can have continued interest only as a period piece. But more than that, with his commitment to narrative, or as he called it “humanistic” history, the essay was not Nevins’
forte. He could forcefully range a cast of hundreds of characters in a drama of human events, but his turn of mind did not probe abstract questions in a profound way. This collection of essays, then, is a memorial to an able historian. Yet, when future students want to know Allan Nevins' work at its best, they will turn not to his essays about the writing of history, but to his practice of what he understood it to be.

Allegheny College  

RALPH LUKER
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