
*Pennsylvania* is a veritable feast of Pennsylvaniana. This cornucopian cooperative is everything its preface says it is and more. The book superbly provides "a broad and deep reconstruction of life in the Keystone State at the time of the American Revolution, showing how the people of Pennsylvania reflected the colonial experience in general and also how they were unique" (p. 8). Containing five main parts—land and people, occupations, ideas, arts, politics and war—divided into twenty subsections, *Pennsylvania* also regales the reader with sixty-eight vignettes of significant persons, groups, places, things, and processes. There are 512 pictures of which forty-two are in color. It is a banquet not only to be spread upon the table (though not sharing the vapidity of the genre, *Pennsylvania* is handsome enough to qualify as a tabletop book), but to be ingested as well.

The book is coauthored by eighty-one representatives (not excluding students) of the manifold resources of Penn State University and satellite campuses. Experts in history, forest resources, agriculture, mathematics, art history, music, Black studies, journalism, anthropology, and entomology among other disciplines have contributed to *Pennsylvania*. Composed "in honor of the nation’s bicentennial," *Pennsylvania, 1776* does honor, too, to Penn State University.

The work is not a scholarly contribution in the sense that its authors have pioneered newly emerged archives or ventured new interpretations. Its value, rather, lies in its appealing format and more importantly in its luxuriant variety. There is hardly a facet of Pennsylvania’s early history and culture that is not touched upon. It is a compendium of information and unlike most compendia it is as stylish in its prose as in its pictorial aspects.

*Pennsylvania*’s editors wisely did not allow "1776" to become a constraint. The book is not a still picture; it has long perspective. We see the development of a unique and pluralistic culture to the Revolution. The last part details that culture’s response to the revolutionary decades beginning in 1763. *Pennsylvania* is fundamentally an historical work, topically organized and artfully framed within a prologue and epilogue giving the "before and after" of the men and women who participate in the spirit of ‘76.
The book is so attractive that it seems petty caviling to point out small faults. Topical organization, particularly in a cooperative work frequently entails some redundancy. We are given similar information on iron on pp. 132, 138, and 238; on the Conestoga wagon, pp. 119, 234, 241; and in various places on John Dickinson, who, according to Rufus Jones and contrary to the text (p. 175) was “probably not a member” of the Society of Friends (The Quakers in the American Colonies. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1966. First published, 1911. p. 559). That the acts of navigation and trade were hurtful to the colonies is an obiter dictum (p. 140) with which most scholars of the subject today take serious issue. Philip S. Klein, who authored the Revolution chapter, surely knows that Franklin’s removal from the postoffice occurred in 1774, not 1768 (p. 317), and that the Boston Massacre occurred in 1770, not 1769 (p. 318). It is also simplifying Franklin’s attitude to say he “initially supported the Stamp Act” (pp. 316, 321). Outright contradiction between authorities occurs only once: the Germans did “not have a special nose for limestone”—they simply got there first (p. 88); they monopolized Pennsylvania’s limestone areas because they were similar to their homelands or “by their knowledge of soil fertility” (p. 108).

But these are mere reviewer’s quibbles. Robert Secor and his coeditors have managed to create unity out of diversity. Every chapter provides significant information. Particularly strong to this reader are George Beatty, “Flora and Fauna,” which is stunningly illustrated; the multi-authored chapter, “Earning a Living,” which is particularly good on commerce; Luther Harshbarger and John Frantz, “Religion,” and the lavish chapter “Folk Arts in Pennsylvania” by Kenneth Thigpen. But singling out these parts is not to denigrate Pennsylvania’s chapters on the Indians, music, literature, art, architecture, printing, and all the other subjects that made up the texture of early Pennsylvania life.

Endpapers include a chart of the development of Pennsylvania counties and an up-to-date and quite extensive bibliography organized according to the major divisions of the book. There is also a useful index. The book is a beautiful production. It will be treasured by Pennsylvania buffs particularly and by all students of our early history for many decades to come.

San Jose State University

Thomas Wendel


This lavishly illustrated volume is much more than another coffee table decoration, though it will adequately perform that function as well. Edwin Wolf 2nd, who should need no introduction to the readers of this journal, has produced a fascinating Bicentennial gift of his native city. Though his stated purpose is to write for the general reader (there are no footnotes or bibliography), the scholar will find this work valuable too.

Each of the twelve chronological chapters begins with a four to five page overview of the period. Space limitations will undoubtedly cause...
specialists in each area to complain that these introductions are too brief or oversimplified, but such objections should be mitigated by the increased space available to illustrations. The illustrations, the majority of them in color, are the heart of the book. Wolf includes paintings, broadsides, cartoons, and photographs, all carefully identified and explained. Most of them come from the Library Company and the Historical Society, but others are from such scattered depositories as the New York Historical Society and the Huntington Library.

Wolf tends to de-emphasize, though not ignore, politics, especially in the earlier periods. The focus is on social history, education, the arts, the commercial life of the city. Especially interesting in this Bicentennial year are the chapters on Philadelphia's very successful Centennial celebration in Fairmount Park and not-so-successful Sequi-Centennial celebration.

Either because of the reviewer's own biases or because of the difficulties an author has in writing about his own times, the book seems more interesting when Wolf writes about the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The last two chapters (the years since 1930) tend to be more political in their emphasis and at times seem to verge on boosterism. But this is a minor criticism of a thoroughly enjoyable book.

*The University of Texas at Arlington*

**Robert F. Oaks**


Originally a dissertation at the University of Nebraska, Richard G. Miller's compact study traces the development of the "first party system" in Philadelphia, the capital city for nation and state. The author's thesis is essentially that politics in Philadelphia in the 1790s involved clashes within the urban upper class between different interest groups which were "for the most part small and local, not broad and national" (p. x). According to Miller, parties originated in the desire of the wealthier "tory gentry" (Federalists) to regain the power lost under the Constitution of 1776; the Republicans are cast as primarily men of new wealth who wanted little more than the privileges accorded old wealth and who used democratic rhetoric to court the votes of working class people and immigrants. Thus, parties represented a means to an end and elections represented "conflicts between men adhering to different socio-economic value systems" (p. x). By 1796 the dynamic battle among elites for political control of Philadelphia—a city with a strikingly inequitable distribution of wealth—resulted in the establishment of two urban political machines.

Miller's thesis is more suggestive than original and it is maintained more by repetition than by evidence. His picture of party origins, for instance, dismisses too much of what is known of the highly personal, issue-laden political struggle in Philadelphia before and after 1789. Deprivining himself and his readers of an in-depth perspective of the bitter conflict that began during the Revolution, Miller also largely sidesteps and makes incidental the complicated Federalist-anti-Federalist alignments of 1788 that others have projected into the 1790s. Because he mainly
determines social complexion by examining a small group of party candidates, Miller inadequately develops the make-up and motivations of the Federalist and Republican parties. For instance, Miller constantly refers to the “Philadelphia Junto,” accepting what is a Republican term for their opponents, but neither indicates its size nor proves it was a genuine decision making body. In addition he fails to see the evolution of a “dual party” system in which shifting coalitions assumed different sets of party identities when contesting state and national elections.

There are several other aspects of the study that are equally troublesome. The author’s cynical view is that issues such as Hamiltonian finance and foreign affairs contained no ideological content whatsoever, but were merely convenient vehicles to sustain men in their quest for political power. Much of the evidence suggests otherwise. Miller is at his best when discussing the mechanics of party organization but he demonstrates much less skill when explaining the sources of party support. To illustrate, the author ignores the need to provide his own socio-economic analysis of the Democratic Society of Pennsylvania. This curious omission in part reveals that Miller does not draw a distinction between “party” and “movement.” Finally, there was much more to politics and the split in the gentry than petty social exclusion, lack of rewards, and dissatisfaction over the results of the city election of 1789.

Although the thesis obviously rejects the notion that political parties were organized downward to the local level and that they owed everything to Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison, Miller is not the first one to make such claims. In refuting the well established theme of “national stimulus and local response” outlined in 1950 by Harry M. Tinkcom, Miller also accepts the revisionist themes presented in recent doctoral dissertations on Pennsylvania politics and incorporates recent scholarship showing that the Federalists understood the techniques of party organization and partisan appeal. In fact, Miller depicts the Republicans taking their political cues from the more imaginative Federalists.

Despite certain reservations, Miller has overall succeeded in organizing a cogent, analytical narrative in short, deftly turned chapters. “Gentry and Entrepreneurs,” which is Miller’s most imaginative effort of “social analysis,” sets the tone for chapters 2–9. Miller shows good command of manuscript sources; had he looked beyond the elite sources (i.e., the sources of the “inarticulate” and the records of state political appointments), the author might have written a better book. Notwithstanding, readers will find valuable quantitative data on twenty-two tables. Using census reports and tax rolls Miller correlates the relationship of occupation, wealth, ethnic background, and religion to party affiliation. To his credit there is sufficient balance between the socio-economic approach and traditional political analysis. Yet, all in all, what is still needed when focusing on a single city, is an analytical study that is broader in scope and method and covers the period from 1776 to 1815.

The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

ROLAND M. BAUMANN

James K. Polk, our first dark horse president, has been well served in recent years with the appearance of the excellent biography by Charles Sellers and this handsomely published edition of his correspondence. This volume, which carries Polk's career up to the end of 1836, is not only longer and more expensive than its predecessors, but it is by far the most important for historians of the Jacksonian era. During the two years covered in this volume, Polk was at the center of American politics as Speaker of the House and one of the major leaders of the Democratic Party as it prepared for the election of 1836.

The 1830s was a decade of transition in both American political structure and political culture. As the intellectual environment changed and increasingly opposition politics gained legitimacy, modern mass parties emerged. During the crucial years covered in this volume receding and emerging perspectives clearly overlapped and Polk was himself consumed by the problems of constructing a political party. Not being completely modern he did not see this matter in such excessively functionalist terms, but the problems of maintaining the Democratic party with Martin Van Buren as the candidate dominates these letters.

There were essentially two challenges to party unity and this volume is crucial to our understanding of how the regular Democrats responded to both. Foremost in Polk's mind was the defection of Tennessee Jacksonians, John Bell, who challenged Polk for the speakership, and Hugh Lawson White, who became the major opponent of Van Buren in the election. The White campaign was basically a "no party" effort appealing to the values of the passing political culture. In response the Van Buren Democrats with Polk as one of their leaders developed a strategy to hold the party together, which is laid out clearly in these letters.

The widely accepted view is that the Whigs ran multiple candidates in 1836 in order to throw the election into the House where Clay or Webster might win. The evidence for this has always been slim and generally based on Democratic sources. These letters show clearly that the charge against the Whigs grew out of a combination of continuing fears and conscious manipulation of the symbolism of the "corrupt bargain" of 1824, and was designed to unite the party behind Van Buren. As Aaron V. Brown put it, "I believe a large majority [in Tennessee] are for Judge White against Mr. Van Buren but still a larger majority will be found in favor of Mr. Van Buren rather than look to the house of representa[t]ives for a President. The only difficulty will be convincing the people that adherence to Judge White will throw it into the house." This conscious Democratic strategy seems to have confounded more historians than it did voters.

Another problem facing Van Buren's supporters in 1836 was the slavery issue. Although Polk had few doubts that the Red Fox was sound on the matter, he feared that abolitionist activity would be used against Van Buren in the West and the South. Again Polk feared a split in the party generated by "the ultras of North and South" who would focus upon the
activities of a "miserable handful of abolitionists and fanatics in the North." His few letters concerning the controversy over the abolitionist petitions are very revealing and relate the adoption of the gag rule to the consolidation of the Democratic party behind the candidacy of Van Buren. The Democrats, thus, built their party upon a southern strategy on the most crucial social problem of the day.

Throughout this massive volume, numerous letters—many of the most interesting penned by Polk himself—offer insights on other crucial matters. One gets the clear impression that party development moved from the center to the periphery. The many discussions of profits, investments and speculations would seem to support those who minimize the contrast between the economic ideologies of slaveholders and northern businessmen. Finally, the letters on patronage, mail routes, and party newspapers, especially that of John Rives, an unabashed land speculator and would-be editor of "The Triumph of Liberty," serve to remind the reader of continuing aspects of the business of politics.

All in all this is a fascinating volume; attractive, well edited, and indispensable for anyone interested in early American politics.

Lehigh University

WILLIAM G. SHADE


I was greatly pleased to review this publication on the early history of the coal industry in Pennsylvania, since the growth of this major Pennsylvania industry has been neglected since the publication in 1942, of The First Century and a Quarter of the American Coal Industry, by Howard N. Eavenson of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

After reading the introduction, questions on the depth of research done for this general study came into focus. It was noted that references to two large historical collections that contain significant background material were not included. The first concerns the large quantity of early anthracite material contained in the manuscript collections of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. The second pertains to similar material of bituminous coal industry found in the collections of the Western Pennsylvania Historical Society in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

My interest was then turned to the bibliography where again several fairly recently published studies dealing with specific chapters in this book were not mentioned. To mention several studies of this nature: Enterprise and Anthracite by Clifton K. Yeagley, Jr., published in 1963 by the Johns Hopkins press, and two anthracite studies published by the Smithsonian Institution in 1968 and 1973, both written by this reviewer. It raises a question as to how long was Professor Binder's material "in the works" before it was published. If the material was held by the publishers this criticism should be directed to them rather than to the author.
As a student for many years of the number of companies contributing to the growth of the anthracite industry and the mechanization of the bituminous coal industry in the United States, I was disappointed not to find more data and analysis of the effects of their efforts on the significance and growth of Pennsylvania's coal industry, particularly their great contribution to the importance of coal in the nation's total economy.

Another point in the book that deserves comment is the inconsistent use of the words anthracite and bituminous in discussing coal in general. The point is that the word anthracite alone means "hard coal" and to add on the word coal to anthracite produces the meaning of hard coal (coal). Bituminous, on the other hand, by definition implies any material containing bitumens, so when talking about soft coal, it is required that the word coal be used. It certainly does cause the reader to question the different terminology that appears in the book.

Garrett and Eastwick, locomotive builders in 1837, located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, were significant contributors to the development of anthracite burning locomotives. Their efforts are presented in The Locomotive Engine published in 1872, and written by Joseph Harrison, Jr., and certainly deserve more mention than a one sentence citation in Chapter VI.

I feel that the readers would have been able to relate the size of the industry and its inherent problems of the early period if a map of Pennsylvania, showing the major coal deposits and the transportation systems developed in moving the coal to market had been included. Tabular material, listing rail vs. canal rates and annual coal production would have contributed to the statistical data presented in the appendix.

The history of the Pennsylvania coal industry is more complex than can be told in a publication of this size and significant events during the period have been only casually mentioned. It was interesting to read of the use of bituminous coal by the Philadelphia Gas Works, but of the total coal production during 1860 the amount credited to this use was rather small.

Smithsonian Institution

John N. Hoffman


Although scholars have long recognized the influence of the Society of Friends on colonial America, historians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have focused almost entirely on Quaker contributions to the peace movement, neglecting their response to the broader currents of industrialization and urbanization. Richard Benjamin, former Director of Temple University's Urban Archives Center, fills this lacuna with his book on Philadelphia's Quakers from 1865 to 1920.
Benjamin’s sample consists of 710 Friends drawn from the membership rolls of three Center City Philadelphia Monthly Meetings. He arrived at this number by selecting the names of all Quakers born between 1840–1849 and 1860–1869, purposely skipping a decade to provide a generational gap, and then eliminating transient and irregular members. His final sample constitutes approximately one-quarter of the three Meetings’ total membership in 1900. Utilizing a wide variety of published and unpublished sources ranging from Meeting minutes to manuscript collections at Haverford and Swarthmore Colleges, Benjamin develops career profiles of many of the 710 Friends. His profiles reveal a typology of Quakers extending from the most active within Quaker circles and institutions, the “Weighty Friends,” to the least active group, the “Nominal Friends.” Between these two categories are “Practicing Friends,” those who participated to some degree in Quaker institutional life.

In addition to varying degrees of individual commitment within the community, Benjamin found that Philadelphia Quakerism was divided internally among the Orthodox, who attempted to preserve the Friends’ cultural autonomy and social distinctiveness, and the Hicksites, who sought some form of accommodation and interaction with the larger society. Orthodox Quakers were further split between the intellectually oriented followers of English Friend Joseph Gurney, and the quietist disciples of Rhode Island Quaker John Wilbur. The intense rivalry and internecine strife among these factions, Benjamin maintains, sapped the vital resources of Quakerism and was partially responsible for the failure to formulate a meaningful approach to urban, industrial life. Throughout the book he describes the divergent paths followed by these groups as they reacted to the stress of urban society.

In several topical chapters, Benjamin explores the Quaker response to the significant issues affecting Philadelphia’s citizenry: educational reform, political corruption, business ethics, civil service reform, immigrant problems, and the status of women and blacks. He concludes that the Quaker approach to urban questions lagged behind the efforts of the Social Gospel and Progressive movements. Several factors explain this tardiness. Many Quakers were prevented from taking a fresh approach to the changing needs of the urban populace by their traditional quietism, which bred an anti-organizational and anti-worldly bias, and by their rural origins, which fostered anti-city attitudes. Old habits of benevolence (schools, poor houses and asylums) and old beneficiaries of philanthropy (Indians, blacks, women, and children) rendered Quaker agencies in Philadelphia “inadequate and unrealistic” when compared to private institutions in New York City during this period. Quakers devoted more attention to the Doukhobors, a Russian emigrant group that settled in western Canada, than to the impoverished immigrants arriving at their doorsteps. The settlement house seemed incompatible with the meeting-house.

But despite Quaker hesitancy in adapting to the demands of the modern city, Benjamin depicts how individual Friends, scholar-teachers like Isaac Sharpless and Rufus Jones of Haverford and Jesse Holmes
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of Swarthmore, “introduced Friends to the progressive currents of thought alive in the wider culture and urged them to create Quaker outlets for those impulses.” By 1910 Quakerism already was emerging from its “cocoon of quietism” when World War I thrust the Friends into the political and social arena in defense of their most cherished religious tenet, pacifism. Benjamin’s last chapter details the heroic Quaker stand against the war, a stand sometimes punctured by the action of Friends who compromised their pacifism with the pro-war fever gripping America.

Although Benjamin has accomplished what he set out to do, yet the work had several shortcomings. At times I found it difficult to keep the various sects, splinter groups, and Meetings from becoming hopelessly blurred in my mind. There are some inconsistencies, such as having a Quaker leader plead for restoration of Quaker unity on page 178 and then plead for diversity on page 179. There are some errors, such as the statement that the 1902 anthracite strike was against the Pennsylvania Railroad. Organizationally, there are other difficulties. The tables at the back of the book should have been integrated more smoothly into the text. In the introduction the reader’s attention should have been directed towards the membership sample described in the bibliography. Nevertheless, this is a well-researched and balanced account of Philadelphia Quakerism during an important era.

Rider College

JOSEPH M. GOWASKIE


This is the story of the borough of Jersey Shore, in Lycoming County, Pennsylvania. The town lies near the mouth of Pine Creek (called The Tiadaghton by the Indians), and was settled about 1800. Never much more than a village, Jersey Shore retained a village economy throughout the nineteenth century. Later, in the late 1930s, it became an adjunct manufacturing center to Williamsport. The author briefly traces these developments, along with numerous changes in religion, printing, transportation, education, and town government. Concluding the narrative are short sketches of several neighboring communities, from Salladasburg to White Pine to Antes Fort.

Helen Russell (the narrator) and Carol Baker (listed as compiler) have attempted to recapture the history of the borough in this slim volume. Replete with tax lists and illustrations, The Tiadaghton Tale is more tantalizing than satisfying. It is not particularly well written (apparently the work of a committee), and many of the photographs of town landmarks are undated. This is unfortunate, because the illustrations provide a rich glimpse of social change and development and are one of the book’s most valuable assets. Included also are numerous primary sources—census reports, tax lists, and the like. Here lies the volume’s chief strength. Unfortunately the author seems more interested in capturing bits and pieces of genealogy than in exploring social history.
Throughout the volume we are given lists of names, but not told anything about the people on those lists. For example, a survey of the Pine Creek Township taxables in 1787 listed on page 16 indicates that the largest landholders were non-residents. This is significant for local development and perhaps for local politics. But where did they live? How did they acquire this land? How much influence did they exert on local affairs? Is this a pattern that persists? In short, the volume contains rich data for some extensive and significant interpretation, but nothing systematic appears. The author has rendered a service in providing the data, but has failed to use her extensive knowledge of the area and its people to provide an interpretive framework. Finally, there are neither footnotes nor bibliography.

Franklin & Marshall College

JOHN A. ANDREW, III

*The Democratic Party and the Negro: Northern and National Politics, 1868–92.*

Neither the end of the Civil War nor the abolition of slavery changed the determination of the vast majority of white Americans to preserve the racial status quo and relegate the black population to distinctly second-class citizenship, if indeed citizenship were to be granted. Although the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments ultimately conferred at least theoretical civil rights, both major parties, at times going their separate ways, at times in tandem, frequently negated these rights throughout the remainder of the century. It is the Northern white Democratic role in this process that is the subject of Grossman’s volume.

Democratic politicians gave up naked racism only reluctantly after the Civil War, but the debacle of the 1868 presidential campaign forced moderates to design a strategy to assure queasy Northern voters that the party had indeed repudiated secession and Copperheadism, yet at the same time to facilitate the recapture of Dixie legislatures by native white Southerners who could then solve the “race problem” to their own satisfaction. What resulted was the Democrats’ “theoretical capitulation to Republican Reconstruction, combined with opposition to its practical enforcement.” Not that the Party of Lincoln stood in the way: ironically, Republican presidents after 1876 consummated this process by refusing effective Federal reintervention into the South to protect black civil rights.

Once Redemption was accomplished, the issue of race receded from national politics until the late 1880s. This story is not new; Rayford Logan wrote in 1954 of the “betrayal” of blacks by both parties and public opinion. What Grossman adds is the degree to which Northern Democrats on the state and local level began to compete with Republicans for the black vote, to offer, in certain areas, the promise of civil rights legislation and the same minor patronage sops traditionally tossed out by the Republicans.
That such a course could be modestly successful in convincing blacks to vote Democratic on the local and state levels even though unable to significantly crack the Republican hold on black presidential ballots is testimony to three factors: the growing complacency of white Republican politicians; the active and sometimes sincere appeals of white Northern Democrats; and the realization of some blacks that in certain areas they comprised a significantly numerous electorate to swing close elections.

Black voters alone did not guarantee Democratic electoral victories in Pennsylvania in the 1870s and 1880s, but Robert Purvis and William Still, both elder and respected members of Philadelphia's black community, encouraged independent black voting and a modicum of liberalism among successful white candidates. Both Still and Purvis acknowledged the race's debt to the Party of Lincoln, but saw no obligation to support insensitive local party hacks; instead they supported the successful Democratic candidacies of Samuel King for their city's mayorship in 1881 and Robert Pattison for governor the following year. Both elected officials, Grover Cleveland-style moralistic civil service reformers, proved more willing than their Republican predecessors to put blacks on the public payroll. And in analyzing the voting behavior of members of the Pennsylvania legislature, Grossman finds that only three Democrats refused to support an 1887 civil rights bill, and these individuals represented districts with negligible black populations. Similar patterns occurred in several other, although not all, Northern states.

Some blacks could vote for Grover Cleveland in 1884 with no sacrifice of scruples or conscience, but by 1889 race reentered national politics when the new Republican administration introduced legislation to protect black voting rights in the South. This Lodge Bill, misconstrued by its opponents as a "Force Bill," united erstwhile Northern Democratic moderates behind the Southern wing's insistence that white supremacy be maintained and that no Federal interference in its domestic institutions be allowed. Grossman views the Northern Democrats as "fellow travelers" on this issue because they continued to court black votes in local and state elections with moderate success. So on the issue of Southern home rule the Democratic party was of one mind; on other matters, in the 1880s and early 1890s, members could go their separate ways and not split their party.

The author's research appears to be thorough for an understanding of the racial policies and attitudes of Northern Democrats up to 1892. Numerous manuscript collections have been consulted, as well as the wealth of recent scholarship on the subject. The book is a useful survey which hopefully will stimulate more detailed state studies like David A. Gerber's *Black Ohio and the Color Line, 1860–1915*, just issued in the same series. Although it would be unfair to criticize Grossman for not writing a book on another subject, it must be stated that we learn little of the Northern black community in his pages; one still has to turn to August Meier's *Negro Thought in America* for this perspective. It is no disservice to Meier to say that fourteen years after the publication of his pioneering work, scholars are tardy in building on his foundation. Graduate
students take note: how about dissertations on Purvis and Still, as well as others mentioned too briefly in Grossman's volume?

San Diego State University Theodore Kornweibel, Jr.


Since the Black Revolution of the 1960s, a number of historians have recounted the history of the black ghetto, including Gilbert Osofsky, Seth Scheiner, Allan Spear, David Katzman, and John Blasingame. Now in his A Ghetto Takes Shape: Black Cleveland, 1870-1930 Kenneth Kusmer proffers his interpretation of the ghettoization process. However, Kusmer strives to surmount the provincial flair of the earlier studies which focused narrowly on a specific black community, e.g., Harlem, Chicago, Detroit. Such studies stressed heavily the institutional ghetto, and paying homage to the Chicago School of urban sociology, dwelt obsessively on white hostility as a prime force shaping the black ghetto.

Without fully rejecting urban ecology as a model, Kusmer escapes traditionalism by emphasizing demographic theory, and in great contrast to his predecessors, comparing the ghetto experience in Cleveland to the experience in cities having different demographic and socio-economic profiles. He contends that the argosy of the urban black community cannot be comprehended apart from the whole process of American urbanization. Cleveland, for example, not only had a unique antislavery tradition, but because of its slower pace of 19th century industrialization, the city's black community remained peculiarly stable and exceptionally small until World War I. These characteristics nurtured and perpetuated a dominant black Old Elite militantly committed to an integrated society.

In explaining the emergence of the black ghetto, Kusmer notes the play of economic forces particularly the exclusion of blacks from the new trades, but he cites the rate of black population expansion as the crucial factor shaping the ghetto in various American cities. While, like other cities, Cleveland's white and black population expanded in the 1890s, its black population remained modest compared to black populations in Chicago, New York and Philadelphia. Consequently, Kusmer discovers that while patterns of segregation and discrimination developed early in the aforementioned large, more industrialized cities, in Cleveland the tradition of egalitarianism and the dominance of the black integrationist elite persisted.

It was the phenomenal growth of Cleveland's black community following World War I which abraded the city's integrated living patterns, challenged the hegemony of the "Old Elite", and spawned a "New Elite" of black professionals and businessmen who revelled in the growth of a separate black metropolis. Closely following his mentor August Meier, Kusmer delineates the ideological struggles which accompanied the rise of Cleveland's black ghetto. Washingtonians vied for supremacy against Garveyites and the followers of W.E.B. DuBois. Ultimately, asserts
Kusmer, the rivalry produced the "New Negro" who no longer viewed the black struggle in terms of integration versus accommodationism, but in terms of race pride and racial solidarity. After examining the economic, intellectual and social aspects of the black experience in Cleveland, Kusmer concludes that black America found real opportunity in the city.

Kusmer's study offers a refreshing approach to the history of the black urban experience. He has undertaken an enormous task in attempting a comparative approach to the history of the black ghetto. But, occasionally the dimensions of the assignment prove overwhelming. At times Kusmer inserts comparative data perfunctorily. Periodically, he generalizes despite limited evidence; for example, he bases a treatment of 19th century black Philadelphia almost solely on DuBois' *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899). Only a 1923 article in *Opportunity* documents Kusmer's contention that, prior to 1914, a "clearly defined" black ghetto existed in Philadelphia. (The Philadelphia Housing Association data suggest that while blacks historically clustered around the 7th ward, a remarkably dispersed racial pattern existed in the city as late as 1920.)

Yet, undoubtedly, Kusmer's book is a substantial contribution to the scholarship of the black ghetto. His Cleveland data are very well documented. Kusmer's use of biographical vignettes, his blending of statistical data with manuscript sources, his effort to contrast the black with the immigrant experience (I presume he did not have access to the research of Joseph Barton, *Peasants and Strangers: Italians, Rumanians, and Slovaks in an American City, 1890-1950* [1975]), all help make Kusmer's study an extremely worthwhile contribution to our understanding of the making of the black ghetto.

California State College

JOHN F. BAUMAN


This highly readable and well-illustrated book provides an overview of Pennsylvania's black history. The author, after an introductory chapter, divides Pennsylvania into various geographic areas and emphasizes people and places within each area. People discussed include important Pennsylvania black citizens such as Paul Robeson, Marian Anderson, Richard Allen, Alain Locke, Selma Burke, James Forten, Martin Delaney, T. Chester Morris, Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, and George Washington Williams. The book also mentions Pennsylvania whites, such as Thaddeus Stevens and Benjamin Lay, who have contributed toward black advancement. In terms of geographical areas, the most extensive treatment (a third of the book) is devoted to Philadelphia, an area rich in black history. In his discussion of specific people and places, the author also notes the growth of black institutional life.

In this reviewer's opinion, one of the book's major weaknesses is its failure to weave the various events of Pennsylvania's black history into
a wholistic pattern. The book is like a collection of brief and interesting snapshots of people and events. Though some common aspects are noted, they are not tied into a cohesive whole. Perhaps, the introduction could have provided the book with more cohesion, but it is also a collection of brief, cursory looks at black contributions in such areas as the arts, politics, medicine, and sports. The book is also occasionally marred by errors in geographical locations.

Though the book is not an in-depth, scholarly study and does not contain such academic devices as footnotes, it does introduce the reader to a wide variety of people, places, organizations, and events important in the black history of the Commonwealth. The little-known facts mentioned in the book provide the basis for numerous potential research projects, especially in the area of local black history. The book, with its division into various geographical areas, also can serve as an excellent historical travelogue for anyone with a sense of history traveling within the Commonwealth. Some especially noteworthy features of this publication are its outstanding layout, excellent table of contents, and its numerous high-quality photographs and illustrations.

In the book's preface, Charles Blockson writes of his strong desire to record the achievements of black people. He also notes the extensive travel and research that went into preparing the book. The author's interest and hard work have resulted in a book that will make an important contribution to the recording of the black past in Pennsylvania.

West Chester State College  
ANDREW E. DINNIMAN


This able study seeks to prove that Charles A. Beard's isolationism was not a product of the 1930s but instead had its origins in his early career and that Beard was fundamentally consistent in his views throughout his life. To a certain extent this view is sustained. However, Professor Kennedy himself notes that Beard was disappointed in his efforts to become an unofficial foreign policy advisor to Franklin Delano Roosevelt during the early New Deal. Here we may have a rather typical case of an academic intellectual cultivating a resentment against practical men of affairs who spurn his advice. That hatred of Roosevelt and all his works that was such a marked feature of Beard's later years began here.

Early in his career Beard developed an antipathy toward laissez faire economics and rugged individualism. This was ultimately extended to an aggressive foreign policy that would support business enterprise overseas. Many years later, World War I and its aftermath created Beard's disillusionment with Woodrow Wilson's foreign policy. Later, as a result of trips to Europe in the 1920s, he became skeptical about the worth of European civilization and suggestions that America protect Europe drew his wrath. By this time he was an intense American nationalist, concerned only with promoting American interests to the extent that he might reasonably (though the author never does this) be labelled a chauvinist.
Beard opposed the Roosevelt administration’s initiatives in foreign policy as distracting the country from major unsolved social and economic problems for the sake of European adventures. At the same time, as Samuel Eliot Morison noted, the quality of Beard’s academic writing suffered as he became increasingly an outraged prophet. Even in his youth socially engaged, Beard in his middle and old age became a Jeremiah hurling abuse at all who recognized that it was in America’s interest that militarism in Germany and Japan be defeated. His optimism and faith in human rationality made him (like so many others) naive in appraising the new totalitarianism of the post-World War I period with its violence and contempt for reason.

By the end of the second World War Beard was out of touch with the majority of American opinion on the subject of the war and the post-war world. He was now the object of admiration by ultra-conservatives of the “Chicago Tribune” group, whose domestic philosophy he detested. It is ironic that the young man who carried with him a copy of Ruskin’s Unto This Last as inspiration should end his life as the hero of those against whom he had once fought.

Professor Kennedy’s study is a treatment of Beard the critic of American foreign policy. It is not a full scale biography and even a discussion of Beard’s early work upon which his reputation was founded is scanty. There was certainly more to this man than is brought out here. But within the limits set by the author the book is a good one and well worth reading, even for non-specialists in American foreign affairs and the history of American historical writing.

Rutgers University

JOHN W. OSBORNE


Attorney for the Situation is the autobiography of a corporate lawyer who emerged as a leading humanitarian and statesman of the industrial community. As general counsel, vice president and director of Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Leland Hazard observed the complex relationships among Pittsburgh’s industrialists who spearheaded the Pittsburgh Renaissance after World War II. As a member of Pittsburgh’s community and cultural organizations, he supported causes as widely divergent as educational television and mass transit. As professor of Industrial Administration at Carnegie-Mellon University he provided an humanitarian perspective to the education of business managers. Throughout these various public roles, Hazard maintained a belief in the authority and power of America’s industrial elite. At the same time, this elite, and he as their counsel, had a social responsibility to improve the society from which they reaped their profits.

The son of a Kansas City, Missouri, school proprietor at the turn of the century, Hazard always intended to become a lawyer. After studying law at the University of Missouri and Harvard he embarked upon a
career as a lawyer in Kansas City in the 1920s. While specializing in bankruptcy cases during the Great Depression he came to the attention of Pittsburgh industrialists when he saved a large firm from total bankruptcy.

Upon assuming the position in 1938 of counsel for Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Hazard became involved in New Deal government regulation of business. For Leland Hazard, the New Deal meant not only increased government intervention in corporate affairs but a new era of management and worker relations. As counsel he worked for compromise solutions in both relationships. From hindsight he observed that he "did not then see unionism as one of the prices of an undisciplined—the nice word is pluralistic—society. . . ."

In 1948 his out of court, compromise settlement of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass anti-trust case brought him favorable attention from the Pittsburgh establishment. His "compliance first, profits next" program brought recognition from anti-trust circles of government and business. This attention and respect coincided with the beginning of the Pittsburgh "Renaissance" led by Richard King Mellon.

Leland Hazard's role in the rebuilding and improvement of one of America's dingiest cities has been emphasized incorrectly by some of his attractors. He emerged as a publicist and philosopher for the Pittsburgh Renaissance rather than a central change agent. Hazard was counsel to the elite, not one of them. Still this is not to undervalue his importance in the situation. He served on the Executive Committee of the Pittsburgh Renaissance and his advice was sought on many issues. R. K. Mellon looked to industrialists like himself to remake Pittsburgh; he rarely sought the advice of academicians or professional planners. Perhaps, Leland Hazard most closely approximated the role of the educated advisor.

As a member of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, the successor to the Executive Committee, he chaired the cultural committee. With the advice of his wife, Mary, he effected important cultural changes in the city. One of his most successful accomplishments was the start of educational television in Pittsburgh, the world's first community education station. Hazard notes the failures of the cultural committee as well. Pittsburgh lost a magnificent art collection partly because he failed to intervene, but more importantly because that by the time the collection became available no Mellon dominated the financial and cultural establishment to change dissension into agreement.

Leland Hazard was not content to influence only the industrial and cultural philosophy of Pittsburgh. In the 1960s he influenced the future managers of American business as a professor at Carnegie-Mellon University. Through such courses as "Ideas and the Changing Environment," which was particularly popular, he sought to improve the subjective judgments of his students.

Throughout his career Leland Hazard provided thoughtful and witty insight into important issues confronting society. On poverty he early espoused work for all those able to work. When there is work for all there will be more play for all and hence less illness—"What America needs is more little theaters and fewer big hospitals." On campaign contributions
he advocated publicity not prohibition. Pragmatically, he reasoned that prohibition could always be evaded and how can we prohibit undue influence. During his travels in the 1950s in Southeast Asia to speak on community redevelopment, he astutely surmised the political question not as one of ideology but as one of authority.

More recently, he spoke on the need for metropolitan government to shore up the division between city and suburb. "To adjust our cities to their new role in the life of mankind is the greatest challenge of the 20th century." One solution he heartily supported was the ill-fated metropolitan mass transit plan for Pittsburgh. This failure he attributed to a nihilist mayor and, he implies, to the waning of public power among the Pittsburgh industrial elite.

Indeed it is just the present situation in cities that has diminished the influence of men like Leland Hazard. The decentralization of industry and commerce, the movement of the affluent to the suburbs, and the growing political strength of ethnic and minority groups have changed the relationship between industry and politics. No longer can the industrial elite ally with the political structure to shape the city in their image. For many urban residents the philosophy of noblesse oblige is outdated.

Temple University

Anne Lloyd


This neatly fashioned synthesis has been well received by historians—and rightly so. If on occasion Michael Kammen slips into a routine chronicling, for the most part he weaves the complex and lengthy history of colonial New York into a coherent and enlightening narrative. This is not political history in the guise of something more comprehensive. Social, cultural, religious, and economic topics frequently take center stage, and Kammen brings all these dimensions into focus as he explores the sources and consequences of rampant social pluralism and pervasive materialism, two of colonial New York's most distinguishing features in Kammen's view.

The outlines of Colonial New York are straightforward. Kammen opens with discussions of New York's earliest settlers—both Indian and Dutch—and the vicissitudes of a Dutch colony handicapped by its "relative unimportance in the Dutch Republic's overseas priorities." He then examines the gradual and occasionally contentious Anglicization of a colony that "alone among the continental colonies had been conquered by the English," and he traces the development of New York's economy and polity through the early decades of the eighteenth century. Nicely crafted chapters follow on the religious, cultural, and social aspects of eighteenth century New York, emphasizing its heterogeneous, socially fragmented, secular, and utilitarian characteristics. Kammen concludes with discussions of New York in the Seven Year War and in the coming of the American Revolution, the latter a somewhat disappointing effort that neither links the
revolutionary movement in New York as effectively as it might to the previous history of the colony nor substantiates the author's claim that New York deserves to be called a "cock-pit of the Revolution."

Kammen probably devotes more attention to the sources and consequences of social pluralism than to any other theme in his work—appropriately enough—and yet if he invokes the concept imaginatively he does not always explore its dimensions with great rigor. Kammen sees social pluralism and the attendant instability as enduring phenomena in colonial New York, dating from its early days when the Dutch West India Company wooed immigrants from all over Europe and when Long Island was populated by Puritans from New England who swore only nominal allegiance to their Dutch rulers. The English conquest turned New York into the only "truly bilingual" English colony on the mainland and enhanced its standing as the most heterogeneous. Among the results were political instability, such as Leisler's Rebellion, institutional heterogeneity, such as church establishments in some counties but not others, and a problem achieving community.

Yet, social pluralism as discussed by Kammen has too undifferentiated a quality about it. If social pluralism is always present, it is not always clear how it evolved, or how it differed, depending upon whether one's perspective is on the province as a whole or on individual communities, or how, ultimately, social pluralism in New York differed in its character, intensity, and consequences from social pluralism in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or North Carolina. Kammen's own rich narrative stimulates a number of questions. If New York was the most polyglot of provinces, to what extent were ethnic, national, and religious differences and their consequences moderated by the citizenry's strong secularism and materialism, by Anglicization, by the ready intercommunication afforded by the Hudson River and connecting waterways, and by the colony's economic underdevelopment and therefore limited economic differentiation? And what of those scattered villages—the primary environment for so many New Yorkers—which, Kammen notes all too briefly, were "unities within diversity" during the seventeenth century, comparatively homogeneous and hostile to strangers? How different were they from communities in other colonies, and how did they change in the eighteenth century?

These are not so much questions that Kammen should have explored further in a synthesis like Colonial New York as they are suggestions for consideration lest pluralism become a glibly used concept. Kammen himself has provided an excellent point of departure for reflecting on the significance of social pluralism—and on many other facets of colonial New York.

*National Archives and Records Service*

David C. Humphrey

During the past decade the influences of historical work being done abroad and the celebration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution at home have led to a renaissance in the writing of local history. The emphasis has been, however, on town, community, and family histories. Given the fact that the historical community still has to rely on the obsolete and carelessly prepared historical-biographical studies published before and at the turn of the century, it is imperative that capable scholars write county studies to test the prevailing hypotheses about the causes and consequences of the American Revolution. Consequently, Colonial and Revolutionary Morris County is a most welcomed addition to the history of New Jersey and to Colonial America and it will hopefully encourage other historians of the Revolution to embrace the genre.

The focus of this comprehensive study is on the people of Morris County from its founding to the end of the American Revolution, which roughly spans one hundred years. For the pre-1776 period, five chapters of the book cover such topics as the Lenape Indians, the coming of the first European settlers, the formation of Morris County from Hunterdon County in 1739, and the economy and society. Although Theodore Thayer does not style himself as offering new findings or interpretations, he treats rather well such subjects as office holding, franchise, taxation, poor relief, and land disputes. The economy, consisting primarily of subsistence farming and large-scale iron-making, was we are told based on its own resources. Thayer's treatment of social life is equally traditional in scope and method. He covers such topics as churches, work, marriage, crime and punishment, education, and standards of living. In every respect Morris County was a heterogeneous community dominated by middle class yeomen.

A larger portion of the book recounts the Revolutionary war years (1775–1783) with the major focus on military affairs. Morristown, which became strategically important as American forces traversed the state, was a principal base camp of the Continental Army for much of the war. Indeed, if New Jersey was the “cockpit of the American Revolution” as one writer would have it, Morris County was surely the cockpit of New Jersey. It was following the Battle of Princeton that General George Washington first came to use Morristown. He saw it as an “‘eagles nest’ from which he could harass the enemy while the main part of his army remained secure in winter quarters within the folds of the [Watchung] mountains” (p. iii). Although the bitter winter encampment at Valley Forge has long been remembered, Washington's troops endured equally cold winters in 1777 and 1779–80 when quartered at Morristown and Jockey Hollow. These events, as well as the Battle of Springfield of 1780, are all handled with Thayer's usual flair for military history.

As in the pre-war period, Professor Thayer covers much familiar ground. Yet, he succeeds in illuminating these events by weaving into his narrative glimpses of the social life of the Continental officers (the use of the Ford Mansion and others), the hardships of the rank and file continental
soldiers, and the local warfare between loyalists and patriots within the broader sectional division that existed on a state-wide level. The arrivals of the Marquis de Lafayette and other dignitaries who came to headquarters, the decisions made by George Washington and his command staff, and the personal tragedies that befell the army and the people involved in revolution and civil war are also details highlighted in this volume.

Theodore Thayer is a distinguished historian of the Middle Colonies. All in all he has written a successful county history based on a variety of primary and secondary sources. It is perhaps inevitable that a work of this scope will produce some dissatisfaction with specialists and scholars who will find a flaw here and an omission of desired material there. Anyone who has worked in this field realizes that relating county history can have its limits, and it can be an awesome task since it often calls for a traditional narrative approach written for a general audience. But, Thayer could have written a more scholarly book that at least offered a thesis and possessed a historiographical base. Instead he has written a study that lacks perspective and in-depth analysis. The events in Morris County unfortunately appear in isolation. In embellishing his account with memorable anecdotes, personalities, and colorful details Thayer may have fulfilled the interests of the "general reader," but he has perhaps slighted the specialist and he has also lost an opportunity to establish a model for others to follow. This is not a very glamorous Bicentennial year production, but nonetheless the author and the Morris County Heritage Commission have rendered a valuable service.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission


Fort Laurens was a part of a proposed system of fortified posts on the American frontier. Like so many plans conceived during the American Revolution, the scheme involving Fort Laurens was beset with difficulties from the date of its conception. The coordination of military units assigned to defend the Ohio frontier was difficult at best, and sometimes virtually impossible. Supplying a static fortification isolated in hostile country was often beyond the ability of the hard-pressed nation.

Pieper and Gidney have combined to depict the difficulties that confronted the Fort Laurens garrison as they built and maintained the frontier post during the infancy of the United States. The authors admit that the book is not extensively footnoted and note that "most of the contributors . . . are destined to remain anonymous" (p. v). A note on sources contains reference to numerous manuscript collections held by state historical societies. Many of these manuscripts have been published and comprise much of the documentation in this thin volume.
The authors contend that the United States was confronted with the agonizing choice of allocating inadequate resources to the small continental armies operating along the Atlantic seaboard. However, the West was too valuable to be forfeited to the British without at least some attempt at resistance. In addition, at stake was the future expansion of citizens of the United States into the Ohio Valley. It was deemed vital to establish a presence in the area even though there were few settlers in the region. Presumably, the future success of settlement in the area depended on the ability of the United States to maintain a viable presence in the Ohio Valley. Fort Laurens was one attempt to maintain this presence in the face of stiff British-Indian resistance.

Pieper and Gidney concede, "there were of course small numbers of Americans living on the fringes of the principal Indian lands" (p. ix). But later they state, "Thus the Indian was the 'enemy' not only in the sense that he occupied lands coveted by other Americans, but as a British ally, he was also the enemy within the conventional meaning of the term during warfare" (p. x). In the first instance the white man is the American, while in the second case the Indian is grudgingly granted a share of the designation of American. The authors state, "The reconstruction of a destroyed Indian town required little time and effort" (p. 12), when describing military tactics on the frontier. Perhaps the destruction of villages of the highly mobile plains Indians would stand up under this assessment, but surely not the substantial homes of the Ohio tribes. Again, Pieper and Gidney note, when describing campaigns against the Iroquois of New York, that "the wanton destruction was made good and the Iroquois were none the worse for the experience, only angrier" (p. 72). This casual remark does not consider the debilitating effect of the destruction of the Indians' homes.

An archaeological project, under the direction of Richard Michael Gramly, has been excavating the site of Fort Laurens. A considerable amount of important information has resulted from this effort including a whole new perspective on the vital statistics of the bastion. It is unfortunate that this book was published while this laudable project was in progress. However, the book will appeal to individuals interested in the American Revolution. The lack of footnotes and its brevity will diminish its value to the serious scholar.

Missouri Southern State College, Joplin

ROBERT E. SMITH


Peter Shaw, professor of literature at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, believes that after decades of neglect John Adams's "personality is once again being lost through appreciative rehearsals of his fragmented careers" (p. viii). In twelve chronologically arranged chapters he seeks to establish the kind of man Adams really was. This is no simple task, for John Adams, both in his own day and in ours, has seemed to be a different man to different people. Shaw states in his preface, "Instead of touching on all the events of Adams's life, I have attempted to
view his character, thought, and acts as a whole” (p. viii). In so doing
the author has emphasized certain aspects of Adams’s life at the expense
of others. Interpretations of Adams’s writing, motives, and philosophy
abound. His presidency is treated in twenty-three pages; his retirement
years when, presumably, his character was already formed, in forty-nine.

Consistently the emphasis is upon Adams’s reasons, feelings, and actions.
There is no bibliography, but extensive footnotes at the bottom of nearly
every page provide bibliographical information and testify to the author’s
breadth of research. Five of the many portraits of Adams have been
reproduced.

To establish John Adams’s personality and character, Shaw turns to
psychohistory. On the second page of the first chapter, using an episode
from Adams’s tenth year, Shaw sets the pattern for interpreting Adams’s
character. Chided by his father for not studying, young John expressed
disinterest in attending college. Shaw reports that “When his father
asked, ‘What would you do, Child?’ he replied, ‘Be a Farmer.’” Shaw
labels this a “saucy reply,” the beginning of a life-long pattern of defiance.
Yet to many readers the reply might seem a straightforward and
reasonable answer for a ten-year-old boy living on a farm in 1745.

Continuing his analysis, Shaw reports that when his teacher neglected
to instruct him in arithmetic, Adams began to study it on his own, and
then persuaded his father to send him to a private tutor. Shaw concludes,
“the pattern of initial, apparently motiveless defiance growing into
self-righteousness became a familiar one in Adams’s life. In order whole-
heartedly to commit himself to a task, it seemed, he needed someone to
denounce and the chance to make his own actions appear as an exemplary
demonstration of the virtues he had lacked in another” (p. 5). Thus by the
fifth page of his book, when Adams was not yet sixteen, Shaw portrays him
as motiveless, defiant, self-righteous, and denunciatory. The fact that
Adams worked diligently under his tutor and was able to enter Harvard
at the usual age, is stated but then ignored. Yet, it might be argued that
Adams had a sound motive for studying arithmetic, for criticizing his
teacher, and that he acted intelligently to guarantee his admission to
college.

Shaw uses these incidents from Adams’s youth to illuminate his character
and foreshadow attitudes, decisions, and actions in his mature years.
Despite Adams’s many experiences and responsibilities, Shaw reports
little change or growth in his character. He continues to portray Adams
as a defiant, frustrated, explosive, unpopular, socially awkward, and
politically inept individual. His judgment that “Adams continues to be
treated as a judicious political leader and political scientist, which he was
not” (p. viii), illustrates Shaw’s defining of Adam’s personality and
ability. Emphasizing a “breakdown” in Holland in 1783, Shaw diagnoses
the cause as psychological. Four decades ago Gilbert Chinard found the
basis to be physical exhaustion. It is difficult for the best trained analyst to
interpret the behavior, motives, and words of a living individual. To draw
clearcut conclusions after two hundred years is more hazardous; two
people may extract different meaning from the same material.
Despite extensive research and thorough analysis of the relations of Adams and Franklin, there are times, especially during the presidential years, when Shaw seems not to understand Adams. He writes that the second president had a "vague, idealistic conception of the executive office" (p. 247). Yet Adams was deeply concerned about the role and power of the executive and in voluminous writings discussed and defined his concept of the office. Shaw represents Adams as an impractical man who, in the summer before his election to the presidency, prepared for defeat when he should have been developing "a program for his administration" (p. 248). His presidency, we are told, was marked by "self-destructive trustfulness and mistimed compromises" (p. 249), while his responses to crisis situations were "ineffectual" (p. 250); that he "failed for two years to detect anything amiss within his cabinet" (p. 250); that Adams not only trusted Hamilton but that his entire presidency was marked by a "pattern of excessive trust and forgiveness" (p. 252), and that Adams "tended to take to his bosom" those who were aggressive or antagonistic toward him (p. 252). And yet Shaw repeatedly asserts that Adams angrily rejected criticism. Adams's retention of Washington's cabinet, Shaw states, set a "self-destructive pattern of abrogating power" (p. 255). Shaw also claims Adams's administration was inconsistent, that his "pattern was one of self-righteous response to events" (p. 255). This reviewer takes exception to every one of the above evaluations.

In the twenty-three page chapter on Adams's presidency there are more than thirty errors. Some deal with established fact: C. C. Pinckney was not Adams's running mate in 1796 (p. 248). Adams did not propose a Republican envoy to France at his first cabinet meeting (in fact, a formal meeting of his cabinet was held only a few times during the four years), and three cabinet members did not then threaten to resign (pp. 255–256); rather, Adams proposed a Republican envoy in private conversation with Wolcott, and the latter threatened the resignation of his fellow Hamiltonians. Shaw claims that Adams was "apparently" ready to appoint Hamilton secretary of war in 1798, and cites Kurtz as his authority (p. 252). Kurtz, in the passage cited, expresses strong doubt that Adams ever made such a statement. Shaw supplies an incorrect date for the signing at Môrtesfontaine and also for the publication of Hamilton's pamphlet attacking Adams (p. 267)—the list goes on and on.

Mr. Shaw is an ambitious and a diligent young man, and he has attempted a difficult task. Although aware of Adams's achievements, his devotion to his country and its people, Shaw slights his accomplishments and emphasizes the negative aspects of his personality and character—his bluntness rather than his honesty; his impulsiveness rather than his insight and patience; his uncertainties and hesitations rather than his courageous willingness to act in the face of misunderstanding, criticism and opposition; his "defiance" rather than his independent judgments. Involved in a fiction of Adams's foibles and weaknesses, moreover, Shaw has presented a picture of our second president which supports the myths long attached to Adams, a picture rejected by outstanding historians of the last twenty years.

Cortland, New York

RALPH ADAMS BROWN
This is not the ordinary book about the Pennsylvania Dutch. Little will be learned about bundling, fraktur, or pawnhaas, or even about quaint phrases as "the hurrier I go, the behinder I get." Rather Professor Parsons has written an historical account of the Germans and Swiss who migrated from the Rhineland to Pennsylvania during the years when that state was a colony of Great Britain. His admirable synthesis of the vast body of literature on the subject is displayed in his discussion of how the Dutch became a part of the economic life of the colony, then a part of the political life of the state, and finally a part of the social life of America. The Dutch, both the sect people (Amish, Mennonite, Brethren and other smaller groups) and the more numerous church people (Lutheran and Reformed) were primarily farmers and helped make Pennsylvania the most productive of the bread colonies. Participation in the wars with the French and Indians and, more importantly, in the wars with the British brought the Dutch into the political life of the state. During the nineteenth century Dutch insistence on the use of their language in schools and churches weakened under a pervasive public school system. Nevertheless, even as the author points out, some of the sect people still resist compulsory education and participation in social welfare programs with success.

Throughout an effort is made to treat the different roles played by the sect people and by the church people in American society. An example is the anomalous role played by some of the sect people in the political life of the country. Their pacifism and hence their refusal to participate in war has been looked upon by their non-pacifistic neighbors as at least cowardice if not downright disloyalty. The author illustrates this with a discussion of the response to the Selective Service system during the Civil War and during World Wars I and II. On the other hand the church people proudly served in the armed forces during those wars although, before American entry into World Wars I and II, a few had difficulty deciding whether to support Germany or the Allies of the United States.

At the same time that Professor Parsons, the historian, provides the framework and the explanations for the entry of the Pennsylvania Dutch into an Anglo-American dominated society, Professor Parsons, the student of folk culture, also weaves in information about the many talented Dutch craftsmen and artists: printers, papermakers, woodworkers, painters, composers, and poets. In the final chapter, the current revival of interest in celebrating Dutch culture is described. This revival has made the Dutch country a mecca for tourists that can be satisfied only by a pilgrimage to the region.

The Pennsylvania Dutch is a volume in the Immigrant Heritage of America series. To date at least seventeen volumes have been published by Twayne including The German-Americans by LaVern J. Rippley. Hence, Professor Parsons does not concern himself with the migration of Germans to America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Nevertheless he should have done more with the internal migration of the Dutch in the United States during those centuries, especially with the migration of
the sect people. An early development completely ignored is the Dutch in local government offices, including service as county commissioners in Lancaster and York by the mid-eighteenth century. An awareness of the uppishness of the Montgomery and Northampton County Dutch toward the Berks and Lancaster County Dutch should have been indicated. The Dutch of the former counties identify the Dutch accent with the Berks and Lancaster County Dutch but not with themselves. Finally if we accept the label Pennsylvania Dutch instead of Pennsylvania German then we should accept the label Scotch-Irish (Preface) instead of Scots-Irish which is the label used most frequently by Professor Parsons.

Read the book. Learn about these people who certainly are a persistent minority. Even learn some of the dialect which is included to illustrate effectively a variety of cultural characteristics. Pursue the topics discussed or mentioned by the author in the works cited in the excellent notes and bibliography.

University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point

RUSSELL S. NELSON, JR.


Professor Goldin's book is an important addition to the literature on slavery in the Southern cities, a subject which has been previously examined by Richard C. Wade, Slavery in the Cities, 1964; and Robert S. Starobin, Industrial Slavery in the Old South, 1970. Goldin, a professor of economics at Princeton University, examines the causes of the decline of urban slavery in the last decade of the Antebellum period by using the tools of cliometrical history. She challenges Wade's argument that slavery was incompatible with urban life, by mobilizing an elaborate statistical argument against Wade's conclusions. Goldin maintains that urban slave population fluctuated in magnitude because the availability of substitute white labor in the cities made the demand for slaves there more elastic than in rural areas (p. xiv). The loss of slave labor which many Southern cities experienced in the 1850s was seen as a consequence of the influx of white emigrant laborers and rural Southern whites into the urban South, rather than as the result of strong anti-slavery forces in the cities. The rise in the price of slaves in the decade before the Civil War is explained as being a result of the rural growth and the low rural elasticity because there were few substitutes for slave labor in agriculture.

Goldin explains the apparent fear of slave rebellion and the threats to important social and economic distinctions between whites and slaves as the propaganda of white urban laborers who competed with slaves for jobs. The urban slave owner did not share the supposed fears of the white workers. The system of letting the slave hire his own time and live out developed, according to Goldin, not because slavery was deteriorating in the cities, but because the system provided more flexibility which "enabled
slavery to compete effectively with a free labor system in the city” (pp. 35, 42). These innovations were signs of the adaptability of urban slavery, not symptoms of deterioration and decline.

Goldin’s evidence does not seem as convincing in explaining deficiencies in Wade’s study as does the research which has been done in the comparative history of slavery in the cities of Peru and Brazil, such as Carl Degler’s *Neither Black Nor White*. Slavery flourished in Lima and Rio de Janeiro throughout the Antebellum period. It was not Southern cities as such that caused the decline of urban slavery in the South, but the attitude of whites toward slaves who were black. It would seem that Wade overlooked the race of the slaves while concentrating on their status. Urban slavery in South America remained numerically strong because there was less prejudice than in the United States.

Goldin’s cliometrics do not take into account race, class, or ideology. The significance of the westward expansion of slavery and the effects of the discovery of gold in California are ignored. Goldin also fails to take into consideration the division among slaveholders in the nineteenth century.

The belief that slavery was not disintegrating and dying out in 1860 is hardly a new discovery. Starobin dealt with the subject and concluded that although slavery was probably “incompatible in the long run with full industrialization, the point at which this inconsistency would manifest itself had, apparently, not yet been reached between 1790 and 1861” see: (*Industrial Slavery* p. 189).

Goldin’s monograph should be of interest to those in the fields of urban history, black studies, and slavery.

*Morehead State University*

**Victor B. Howard**


Blumin’s survey of Kingston, New York, is a prime specimen of a familiar species. It is a case study of an inherently unimportant community which participated in trends of national significance. The book varies from its type chiefly in emphasizing “the urban threshold,” that period in the history of a city when it first achieves sufficient size, density, and heterogeneity to be recognizably urban. For Kingston, the four decades before the Civil War constituted such a “threshold.” In studying this place at this time, Blumin confirms many scholarly stereotypes and challenges some others.

The author most surprises us when he examines rural Kingston, an old Dutch agricultural town with access to New York City and commercial ties to New England. Kingston maintained entrepreneurial values and manifested a weak sense of community before about 1830. Independent households supported an individualistic social ethic, and
villagers, while friendly enough to one another, exhibited little corporate consciousness and pursued few group activities. Blumin thus contradicts the assumption of a rich communal life in rural villages, and this contradiction is crucial to his subsequent argument. In fact, the impact of this book may depend on how many readers will accept such a heretical conclusion based largely on negative evidence.

Blumin's second section documents how the building of the Delaware and Hudson Canal by outsiders transformed Kingston into a small but vigorous city. Local financial, industrial and commercial enterprise expanded. Then, as Kingston grew, it attracted diverse, sometimes hostile ethnic groups and developed a complex class structure. Meanwhile, it became a place of crowded, functionally specialized neighborhoods whose very existence implied less independent households. While the author focuses on social change, his economic analysis is still more instructive. He shows how construction of a national transportation system stimulated local entrepreneurs to improvise strategies for exploiting that system in ways that the builders never foresaw.

The third section considers community institutions. Urban Kingston witnessed increasing interest in all kinds of civic and cultural activity. Greater emphasis on self-conscious local groups both checked individualism and created a problem for such national entities as political parties. For the first time, successful politicians had to establish the local relevance of their themes. In Kingston, this meant stress on local economic growth or on the ethnic issues which preoccupied a city with an immigrant majority.

Finally, Blumin addresses himself to community leadership. First, he shows that class was the most important factor in determining who joined and led Kingston’s organized activity. Length of residence and, surprisingly, ethnicity were much less decisive here. To explain his finding, Blumin studies the values of the city's respectable population. He discovers a general conviction that entrepreneurial imagination and industrious habits were responsible both for progress and for order. Those who had demonstrated these traits were expected to lead, whatever their origins.

In short, Blumin studies Kingston in order to understand the process of urbanization in nineteenth century America. He finds, as one would expect, that inclusion in a national system of cities stimulated local economic growth and disrupted social patterns. But the experience did not demoralize society. Confident in entrepreneurial values which antedated urbanization, Kingston enjoyed a richer communal life in 1860 than it had in 1820. If its experience was typical of “the urban threshold,” the transformation from town to city was less painful than most scholars have imagined.

How reliable is Blumin's conclusion? The concept of community is an unusually slippery one, and it is difficult to use effectively even with the best of evidence. Blumin, to his credit, carefully points out the serious gaps in the surviving record of nineteenth century Kingston. When an author argues as well as this one does from the best available information,
we cannot reject his most heretical contentions. But when his evidence is so sparse and his problem so elusive, we must withhold affirmation until other studies of other cities test his ideas.

Meanwhile, the best known analysis of community in an urbanizing environment is Michael H. Frisch’s history of Springfield, Massachusetts, from 1840 to 1880. This work partly supports Blumin and partly contradicts him. Frisch also sees an upsurge of formal group activity at “the urban threshold.” But whereas Blumin considers this a genuine quickening of community sentiment, Frisch depicts it as a substitute for the more vital informal sense of community that had permeated the small town of Springfield. Is Blumin correct? Is Frisch? Is each man accurate about his own city? If each is accurate, which city is more revealing of the process of urbanization? Again, answers must wait upon future scholarship.

But the reviewer who suspends judgment on Blumin’s thesis may still admit unambiguous respect for the way in which the author asks his questions. Without striking scientific poses, Blumin unobtrusively refines Frisch’s analysis by introducing relevant concepts from community sociology and urban geography. He seems especially impressed by the views of Roland L. Warren. Whatever answers future historians settle upon, their task will be eased by this modest, intelligent study.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania  
LARRY C. MILLER


In this modest collection of essays nine distinguished historians, including Richard H. Abbott, George M. Blackburn, Felice A. Bonadio, Richard N. Current, Robert R. Dykstra, David Montgomery, John Niven, Philip D. Swenson, and the editor, James C. Mohr, have attempted to show that the impact of Radical Reconstruction on the Northern states was anything but uniform in nature. All of the essays appear for the first time in print except the one by David Montgomery which was originally printed in 1961 in the Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography.

Here is a series of studies dealing with Radical activities in nine separate states—Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa—during the decade following the Civil War. On first glance at the title and the format the reader might be inclined to dismiss the book as being exceedingly provincial and, therefore, of limited importance. He would, however, be wrong on two counts. The book is not provincial in format for the authors of these essays have addressed themselves to a specific number of problems which each state legislature had to deal with in its own way according to the needs and wishes of the citizens of that state. These problems included race, political factionalism, governmental activism at the state level, the emergence of ethno-cultural political patterns, and the relationship between postwar politics and economic interests. In the second place, the reader would be
wrong because the word "provincial," or some similar word, is important. As the editor has suggested in his introduction and as the writers of the various essays have substantiated with ample evidence, provincial is a good word to use to describe the nature of politics in the Northern states during the Reconstruction years. The alleged centralization resulting from the Civil War had, in fact, not occurred. Political parties were still pretty much state affairs. State politicians were key figures at the center of the most significant cross pressures of the postwar period. The national government played a relatively minor role in the daily lives of average Americans. A state-by-state survey is, therefore, a very valid method of examining the activities of the Radical Republicans in the North in the decade following the war.

The resistance to the Civil War amendments to the Constitution is amply demonstrated in the essays, but the post-ratification adjustments are not. The Northern states as well as the Southern states had to revise their individual constitutions so as to comply with the new conditions. A number of states came up with new constitutions while others made extensive changes in existing ones. This particular aspect of Northern Reconstruction receives less attention than it deserves.

The principal shortcoming of the book is one of format rather than scholarship. This is definitely not a book to be read in one sitting. Since each essay deals with the same general problems as applied to a particular state, the result is, to say the least, a bit monotonous. If, however, one reads one or two essays at a time—I might even go so far as to suggest a random choice, Iowa contrasted with Pennsylvania, Wisconsin with Massachusetts, etc.—the great virtue of the book is still obvious without being dull. For, taken as a collective entity, the book does show the great variance that did exist during the Era of Reconstruction when problems, supposedly national in scope, were dealt with on the state level.

 Albright College

William W. Hummel


Brooke Hindle describes 1876 as "the largest and most colorful exhibit ever mounted by the National Museum of History and Technology, . . . a microcosmic re-creation of the Centennial Exhibition." It was "an exhibit of an exhibit," necessarily reduced in size and scope from that of a century ago but nonetheless "it is the Centennial." In the process, the Smithsonian displayed about fifteen percent of the objects shown at Philadelphia; these were restored to like-new appearance. The remainder "is of the Centennial period, and nearly everything could have been in Philadelphia in 1876."

To fit this innovative approach, the volume under review "is not an exhibit catalog in any traditional sense. Rather, it aims to tell something about America in 1876, about the great Centennial Exhibition, about the enormous variety of material objects displayed, about the exhibitors—and, about 1876."
John Maass provides a perceptive historical review of the Centennial Exhibition, its projection, funding, construction, and activities. He asserts that the Exhibition "proved to be a turning point in American history" and indicates statistically that our nation had moved from a negative to a positive balance of trade in 1876. Not only did the Exhibition change "the image of America in the world," but it also "boosted American self-confidence," and "revealed the United States as the world's biggest industrial and economic power." Without attempting to moralize, Maass is aware that all this was happening concurrently with major scandals, lackluster political leadership, and economic depression, and with a disputed Presidential election and violent labor problems developing within the year.

The body of this catalog is devoted to historical and pictorial studies of the original Halls and their exhibits, the accounts being written by Smithsonian staff members. Machinery Hall was dominated by George Corliss's Centennial Engine and Babcock and Wilcox's water-tube boiler, both prime examples of the great advances made in the use of steam. Specialized woodworking and metalworking machine tools, powered by steam, pointed to an age of mass production, while the 4-4-0 locomotive represented the epitome of the application of steam to land transport.

In the Government Building, the Smithsonian had an ethnology exhibit, an animal display, and a variegated collection of mineral specimens. The Patent Office showed models of American inventions in 33 categories, while the Navy Department's display helped to revivify popular interest in that service. In foreign and domestic manufactures—furniture, ceramics, glassware, silver, textiles, vehicles, timepieces, and the like—American-made goods had caught up to and in some cases surpassed their European-made counterparts.

The Women's Pavilion "presented them [women] with their first big chance to show off the full scope of their capabilities and accomplishments." The number and proportion of exhibits related to women were greater than at any previous exhibition, and many women were on hand to show their inventions in dressmaking systems, washing machines, and kitchen tools. Graceanna Lewis of Chester County exhibited a Chart of the Animal Kingdom which won a Centennial medal for her, while suffragists, led by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, staged a counter-demonstration to the Exhibition on July 4.

Pennsylvania, as the host state, had the largest number of exhibits in 1876, and both then and a century later this state, its organizations, and citizens played important roles in the exhibitions. The magnitude and variety can be measured by some of the donors and lenders to 1876—Chester County Historical Society, Frick Company, Haverford College, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Pennwalt Corporation, Philadelphia Free Library, and the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

1876 and this catalog, which eminently achieved their purposes, are mileposts in the history of American material culture. The Smithsonian is to be congratulated for both.

West Chester State College

ROBERT E. CARLSON