THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE AT HARRISBURG

The Annual Research Conference, sponsored jointly by the Pennsylvania Historical Association and the Historical and Museum Commission, convened on the afternoon of March 31 at the historic John Harris House. The general chairman, James P. Rodechko of Wilkes College, announced that the conference was open and introduced the president of the Historical Society of Dauphin County, Carl B. Stoner, Jr. President Stoner welcomed the conference to his Society's building, after which the general chairman turned the first session over to Carroll J. Hopf of the Pennsylvania Farm Museum at Landis Valley. Hopf was the chairman and third speaker of a panel dealing with Pennsylvania agricultural history.

Robert M. Blackson of the Altoona Campus of Pennsylvania State University discussed agricultural economics in the Era of Good Feeling, emphasizing western Pennsylvania's farming in relation to the economy of the whole state. In the decade following the Treaty of Ghent, Pennsylvania farmers experienced four years of prosperity followed by six of adversity. Crop failures in Europe, from 1814 to 1816, created a booming market for American farm products. In March and April 1817 wholesale price indexes of Pennsylvania agricultural commodities and of farm derivatives (flour, cornmeal, dairy items) reached maximum highs for the entire period from 1783 to 1861. Prices for domestic and foreign goods (including manufactured items) entered a long-term period of decline at the end of 1814. Farmers, therefore, enjoyed the advantage of a price differential which lasted from 1815 to 1820.

The superior routes to market, the fertile land, and the farm techniques, found in the eastern third of Pennsylvania were in contrast with the western Pennsylvania farming situation. There, farm
methods suffered from the inertia of tradition. In addition to problems of soil and terrain, transportation was crude and currency not readily available. Often farmers could only barter their surplus to merchants who floated it on barges to Pittsburgh, for marketing. The river transportation routes made the trade seasonal. It was very expensive to market commodities in the East, though some farmers managed to do so. Some western Pennsylvania products were carried to New Orleans, and there were growing markets in the infant cities along the Ohio River.

Throughout Pennsylvania much of the farmers' new profits was invested in purchases of additional land. Both the land market and the banking industry which financed it enjoyed success, until December 1818. Then three factors combined to end farm prosperity: (1) the second Bank of the United States forced state banks to curtail loans, (2) Europe reaped bumper crops, and (3) the British government decided that its Corn Laws prohibiting grain imports were to be strictly enforced. The price advantage enjoyed by farmers was reversed. Low points for farm prices occurred in 1821 and although prices recovered slowly after that, the entire country was in a depression from 1819 to 1824. The farmers' worst debt problems had to do with lands acquired on credit. In Pennsylvania much of the land had to be sold by the creditors at public sales. The amounts received at sales were so much less than the amounts farmers had pledged to pay when they had purchased—during the period of prosperity—that it appeared that years of the farmers' hard work had gone for naught. Manufacturers, seeking farmers' support for high tariff policies, sponsored Berkshire-type societies in order to gain agrarian support. In 1820 the General Assembly authorized county societies to promote agriculture and domestic manufacture. It also entertained bills for creation of a loan office and for a minimum appraisal and stop law. These might have been of assistance to impoverished farmers in the long run, but their problems were too close at hand for them to receive any immediate benefit from such legislative solutions.

Blackson mentioned four areas where more scholarly work seems appropriate. It is still not clear whether most Pennsylvania farmers supported or opposed protection. An analysis of election returns for the county districts would show which districts supported and which opposed protective tariffs. Also, there are many questions about the farmers' relationship with the banking industry. It would be interesting to know what debts farmers incurred during their
period of prosperity. Where did farmers stand on proposed bank legislation? Blackson has found disappointingly few records of law suits by banks against indebted farmers, but he hopes that there are other ways to learn the truth about farmers' obligations. The market techniques of western Pennsylvania farmers is a third area that needs to be explored. Blackson suspects that more farm products were marketed east of the mountains than historians have previously assumed. Finally, more information is needed about the farm techniques used by western Pennsylvania farmers.

The second speaker was Maxwell Smith, the Pennsylvania state agricultural extension agent for Lancaster County. Drawing on his experience in Lancaster County and his earlier years in Washington County, Smith described conditions in Pennsylvania agriculture today. He emphasized the impact of specialized farming and the competitiveness which forces the farm family to work as a smooth business unit. Such families, although still dwindling in number, are more efficient than corporate farms, and Smith is certain that the family unit will prevail as the basic agricultural business entity. Since plant, animal, and machine productivity have grown tremendously in recent decades, the availability of land is more critical than ever. Only four per cent of our population engages in farming; only fifteen per cent of the children growing up in farm families today will be needed to perpetuate the farm work force into the next generation. A farm is still a good place to rear children, since food production instills the virtues of diligence and perseverance. Farmers contribute heavily to the nation's economy as consumers. Most Pennsylvania farmers are unfavorable toward a farmers' strike, if any alternative solution can be found to gain for them what they are convinced they deserve. But they are more vocal and politically active than in the past, attending evening meetings and making decisions dealing with such issues as land use and implementation of government regulations. Smith* believes that the public must absorb the cost of additional regulations imposed on the farms, since it is the public that benefits from these in the end.

Carroll Hopf spoke on social customs in Pennsylvania rural society from the colonial period through the nineteenth century. Focusing on activities outside the daily work routine, he explained that social life centered around families, churches, and schools. Using quotations from Stevenson Whitcomb Fletcher's *Pennsylvania Agricultural and Country Life, 1640–1840* (1950) and material compiled by Herbert H. Beck for *The Pennsylvania Dutchman* of February 1954, he compared
eighteenth century Anglo-Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania Dutch marriage celebrations. He then compared two funerals. Gottlieb Mittelberger, a German tourist, had written about a funeral in Pennsylvania in 1754, and Phoebe Earle Gibbons has left a description of a funeral in the Pennsylvania Dutch area in the 1860s. In both, the mourners shared the grief of the family, although there was socializing and consumption of food. Next Hopf quoted from contemporary historical descriptions of other rural events which had formed the basis for social gatherings. These included a corn husking party, a fall butchering, and a community land-clearing project. The speaker also read two accounts of itinerant preachers, one of whom had been affronted by townspeople who preferred to frequent ball-alleys rather than hear a sermon—on any day except Sunday. Social gatherings provoked by the schools included playing ball in the playground and a sleighing party.

The speaker at the dinner that was given at the Holiday Inn-Town was Stephanie G. Wolf of the University of Delaware, who is the Coordinator of the Winterthur Program in Early American Culture. Her address on the interdisciplinary approach to the past was entitled “Marriage of Love or Convenience?” A history conference such as this, she said, which has programs on urban mobility and genealogy is a far cry from the sort of history that was once described as past politics. Clearly we are in an interdisciplinary era, but she questions whether we can continue to use all the other disciplines to make the past relevant. She then proceeded to trace the marriage of disciplines which makes up the interdisciplinary method.

In 1910 a minority within the American Historical Association began a series of discussions on methods. These stressed the need for more social science approaches. With the measured dignity of historians, it was not until 1946 that further progress occurred. The Social Science Research Council issued its provocative Bulletin 54: Theory and Practice in Historical Study. This report of the Council’s Committee on Historiography called for a cessation of squabbles over philosophical matters such as causality and truth, and argued that the main thrust of history should be toward “at least a cumulative body of knowledge to be useful as a guide to solving our present problems of human relations.” Briefly commenting on this early recognition of the problem of relevance, Wolf said that the 1946 statement meant that historical scholarship should fall increasingly under the social sciences and less within the humanities. Historians should state hypotheses to be tested in some quantifiable
manner, thus falling within the definition of the scientific method.

In 1954 the Committee on Historiography, now composed of
different individuals, issued another bulletin, Social Science Research
Council Bulletin 64: Social Sciences in Historical Study. By that time area
studies programs, bearing various titles such as American studies,
had become widespread on American campuses. Describing these
as a "Chinese dinner approach," she said such programs were more
an integration of requirements for purposes of student scheduling
than true interdisciplinary teaching. In such programs history was
often combined with other humanities (history and literature,
history and philosophy, art history, etc.), rather than being com-
bined with social sciences. But the Committee in 1954 asked that
a conscious effort be made to adapt political science, economics,
sociology, psychology, anthropology, archaeology, and demography,
to historical scholarship.

The attitude of the American public in the 1960s had much to
do with the success of the interdisciplinary curriculum. Political
and intellectual upheavals, such as (a) the desire to learn about
people other than the elite; (b) the apocalyptic attitude toward
continuation of the traditional family; and (c) a popular mood in
favor of aid to minorities, led scholars to a much wider emphasis
on social history. Previously most statements of social history had
been confined to the final chapters of books whose main thrust was
political history. In contrast, most books today place more emphasis
on social-economic status—"S.E.S."—of historical figures already
generally recognized—like the founding fathers—than on considera-
tion or reinterpretation of the major achievements of their careers.
The emphasis is so prevalent that authors assume it will be favorably
received and they no longer even comment on the matter. Today
the greatest amount of work is going into studies of community
and family. The next greatest emphasis is on psycho-history.

The three main contributions being made by the new marriage
of history with the social sciences are: (1) learning more about people
of the past by asking the same questions about them as psychologists
and sociologists ask about us today, (2) innovating as to the kinds
of data we use to answer such questions, and (3) broadening out
the kinds of methods we use. The current craze for use of lists is an
element of points (2) and (3). Any kind of list is considered worthy
of historical emphasis—church lists, tax lists, lists of soldiers, etc.
But there is a danger here, she said. Unlike today's statistical analyst
who can fill in gaps that arise in his research data by sending out
questionnaires, the historian who works on an historical list that is in any way incomplete, defective, or ambiguous, cannot correct its defects. A narrow, incomplete, or misunderstood list may give the historian a picture that he really does not want. Such distortions have shaped the development of family history. Originally scholars wanted to learn about the personal relationships within families and between families, but the use of lists as the basic source for family history has led to statistical pictures of the exteriors, or parameters, of families of the past. An undue emphasis on the colonial history of New England families is another distortion caused by the prevalence of extant lists from that area. As compared with Pennsylvania, which kept very poor colonial records, New England has provided much with which to work. Therefore, New England patterns are being accepted as the model for all the American colonies. Wolf thinks this is regrettable. She mentioned that historians relying on lists are often defying one of the basic principles of statistics, the need to start with a good sample.

The computer and similar innovations should not be overemphasized. The Social Science Research Council’s Bulletin 64 had warned against them, saying that “devices” should be used only if they assist historical scholarship, discarded if they do not. The speaker’s objection to the computer is that it may lead the historian to “play so many games so fast that he forgets to ask whether he has the right to play those games at all.” This happens too often today, she said. Model building, too, has undesirable results. Here, again, she mentioned the inappropriate use of New England colonial patterns as models for what went on elsewhere in the colonies. She also looks with disfavor on the counterfactual approach.

Demography is one area that historians have gone into wholeheartedly, because it is obviously so pertinent and is a subject easy for someone trained only in history to master. But, she warned, the demographer’s approach differs from the historian’s. For the demographer the statistical trends themselves are the subject of scholarly interest, not the human experiences behind them. Also, the demographer does more predicting than any historian should. Furthermore, certain terms, like “fertility” and “fatality,” have specific meanings for the demographer which go beyond the dictionary definition of those terms. The historian’s desire for information on how people actually lived is his only justification for delving into the works of demographers. Another weakness of the emphasis on demography is that scholarship is changing rapidly in that field.
It does not stand still long enough for thoughtful analysis to occur. For all these reasons, demography is difficult to wed to history.

Since her involvement with the Winterthur Program, Wolf has come to recognize the great value of physical culture. A methodology for it must be developed. For one thing, we need some way to combine data drawn from surviving physical objects with the less-complete information we have about non-surviving material culture. The historical picture will be distorted until this has been accomplished. It is not surprising, the speaker commented, that dwellings preserved in a small black community adjacent to the Plymouth Plantation archaeological site are a better representation of early black African housing than the Plymouth Plantation's structures are of seventeenth century English housing. The factors of chance that have preserved some objects and destroyed others must be confronted. It is very important to have close cooperation between historical archaeologists and historians, and for that reason she recommends James Deetz's *In Small Things Forgotten* which makes extensive use of historical archaeology.

Art history has been touched by the same trends as historical archaeology. There is more emphasis now on the history of decorative arts and less on the great master painters. Also, there is much greater emphasis than there used to be on the S.E.S of the artists.

Wolf objects to the repetitious use of the phrase "case study" because it has been applied in too many atypical situations. Similarly, she questions statements made by Lawrence Stone, in *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500–1800*, because he has drawn conclusions from six married and unmarried men who had "lives on the town." Stone says that these six left the only male autobiographical statements, between 1500 and 1800, dealing explicitly with sex. That being the case, the speaker said, they were so atypical that they probably give a distorted view of the general population's attitude toward sex.

Most popular history today is still in narrative prose form. Advance scholarship which is esoteric, arranged by topics as in a text, or written in a static style, simply will not correct popular misconceptions of the past because the public will not take the trouble to read it. The fact that a gulf exists between the historian and the public is in part the result of historians using social scientific methods derived from the interdisciplinary marriage.

In conclusion, the speaker said the association of history with the other disciplines may be one partly of love and partly of convenience.
She hopes that it will not be a marriage until death do us part, but
one of living happily ever after.

In the first of two Saturday morning sessions held in the Search
Room of the Archives and History Building, Harold E. Cox of
Wilkes College chaired a panel on new directions in urban mobility.
After pointing out some of the weaknesses of the older urban histories,
the chairman introduced Burton W. Folsom of Murray State Uni-
versity, who read a paper on urban growth in the anthracite region
and its relationship to regional economic development between
1800 and 1880.

The coal industry emerged in the Lackawanna Valley around
1820. Northeastern Pennsylvania had been settled around 1760 and
by 1800 there were five aspiring towns in the most northeastern
portion of the region (now the counties of Wayne, Susquehanna,
and Lackawanna). These were Montrose, New Milford, Honesdale,
Towanda, and Dundaff. They developed a mixed commercial econ-
omy and an urban elite of bankers, lawyers, and businessmen. Their
surplus of capital would eventually have led to growth, but the
emergence of the coal industry in the Lackawanna Valley, im-
mediately to the southwest, changed the dynamics of development.
Carbondale was founded as the center for the coal industry and
the five towns became subordinate to it, their area being reduced
to the status of a hinterland. The construction of the Delaware and
Hudson Canal in the late 1820s cemented Carbondale’s position;
it was the main artery for marketing the coal. But Carbondale did
not attract the elite from the five subordinate towns. In contrast,
when Scranton was founded in the 1840s it drained off the elites of
wealth and talent from the five towns and from Carbondale, as
well.

The Scranton brothers’ iron industry (incorporated in 1851 as
the Lackawanna Iron and Coal Company), began in the 1840s
and had true entrepreneurial characteristics. The brothers had to
build their market as well as their industrial plant. Although coal
was abundant, the iron deposits from which they worked were very
poor. Their early venture was also plagued by the ineffectiveness
of their first blast furnaces and by farmers’ hostility. They were able
to prevail by recruiting talented relatives to work for them and by
taking loans from New York City bankers. Making only nails at
first, they enlarged their industry by manufacturing rails for New
York’s Erie Railroad, in the late 1840s. Accumulated capital was
plowed back into the city of Scranton in the form of housing, banks,
and service businesses. The five little cities of the northeast were drained of capital and of men with professional skills. Carbondale lost to Scranton the businessmen who had operated at the managerial level. Such men made a lasting identification with Scranton. This did not subside even after New York City’s influence became very strong in the region. Although New York City interests came to own, through investment, big mining companies and railroads, New York capital did not venture to back the smaller industries of northeastern Pennsylvania. Migrants from Scranton’s subordinate cities, therefore, came to control these smaller businesses.

With the completion of the Erie Canal in the 1820s New York City became the center of a multi-regional system which Folsom referred to as a network. It included the assertion of marketing influence upon Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Boston. In the Lackawanna Valley New Yorkers owned the three major railroads. When they made business decisions it affected the entire region.

Thus, a three-level hierarchical pattern emerged: (1) New York City and its multi-regional network, (2) Scranton and its regional hegemony, and (3) seven small towns founded only because of the coal industry, none of which had any chance for permanent growth. This last group was exemplified by Jermyn and Archibald. Such towns typically had one major entrepreneur and he controlled all affairs from Scranton, not from the town’s business district. Although Carbondale had never tried to challenge the growth of Scranton, Scranton interests—largely transplanted Carbondales and those associated with the Scranton family iron enterprise—did indeed challenge the growth of New York City’s influence in the region. Their loyalty to the city of Scranton was remarkably strong. Thomas and George Dixon and Horatio Pierce were examples of the loyal Scranton elite. A Pittston resident’s description of Scranton as “the lobster town of the universe” was a perceptive recognition of the hegemony Scranton had achieved. Even though there was an upward flow, within the hierarchy, of capital and, somewhat, of entrepreneurial talent, from the seven small coal towns to Scranton, and another from Scranton to New York, there was also a constant descending thrust of New York City power. The Scrantonians were squeezed in between because they had to continue to come up with investment backing—by borrowing—to keep the region’s main industry, anthracite, at maximum production. In large part, Scranton’s established leaders resisted moving their personal residences to New York City.
Patterns of the emergence of cities to regional hegemony are very important. Such patterns might be applied to developments in other regions. Folsom thinks those of the multi-regional network may also be important. The mineral wealth of Alabama, Nevada, and West Virginia, for example, is known to have contributed to the growth, respectively, of New York City, San Francisco, and Pittsburgh. But much more research would be needed to prove or disprove this idea. In conclusion, Folsom said that the region as a unit offered historians a conceptual tool to measure the dynamic process of American urbanization.

Edward Davies of the University of Utah spoke on in- and out-migration of talent in the Pottsville and southern anthracite region from about 1830 to 1900. He pointed out that a pool of talent has much to do with the growth of any city that reaches regional hegemony. A large number of young entrepreneurs, coal miners, and members of other callings entered the region in the 1820s and 1830s looking for opportunity. Pottsville grew rapidly until the late 1860s because it had three advantages over other communities in the southern anthracite region: (1) it was the railroad center, (2) it had an iron industry, and (3) it became a county seat in 1847. In the 1860s the center of coal activity shifted to the northern rim of the southern region and Pottsville’s leadership began to wane.

The talent for leadership in this earlier period came exclusively from the in-migrants. The city itself held no attraction other than economic potential. Moderately successful families from rural Schuylkill County, as well as from surrounding Berks, Bucks, and Montgomery counties, were drained of their most talented sons, by Pottsville. Skilled labor from the British Isles, as well as sons of wealthy Philadelphia families, also came to Pottsville. There was a desperate need for skilled workmen; there was money to be made in land speculation; and after 1847 young men came to train as lawyers in the county seat. Among the three overall pulls working on talented young men—industry, law, and kinship—kinship was the weakest because most of the rising leaders had come from mediocre families from which they were glad to be released.

As a group, these rising in-migrants had already changed jobs several times, married late (75% married between ages 28 and 32), seldom had more than a secondary school education, and continued to be versatile enough to change their livelihood while in Pottsville.

The entire southern section of the southern anthracite region lost out to the northern rim of the region after the 1860s. Minersville
and St. Clair declined, as well as Pottsville. By 1900 the northern rim cities of Mahanoy City, Shamokin, Shenandoah, and Ashland had all surpassed Pottsville. They had drawn nearly half their leadership from Pottsville, men whom Davies divided into (a) Pottsville elite, and (b) skilled labor and small entrepreneurs. An enormous amount of capital moved from Pottsville to the northern rim and twenty-seven Pottsville businesses were undercut by the shifting process. Unlike Scranton, Davies said, Pottsville never really had held a hegemony.

In commenting on sources, Davies recommended the biographical sketches found in the older county and local histories. They should be supplemented by research in wills, city directories, and census data. He was able to detect life cycle patterns for a worthwhile number of nineteenth century individuals by using these readily available but generally overlooked sources.

Spyridon G. Patton of the Economics Department of the University of Pittsburgh discussed economic regional theories in the context of urban growth. His commentary concerned the impact of the Reading Railroad on the development of Reading.

Economic analysis of regions began in the 1950s when it became clear that the United States still had regional distinctions. Since it was recognized that Appalachia had failed to develop industry to the extent that other regions had, economists began to develop models of regional growth. But they have avoided studies that involve long periods of time; they believe they can develop models that explain the present and predict the future without drawing from distant historical experience. Furthermore, unlike size, structure, and space, the factor of time (history) is a non-economic variable which is difficult to include in an economic model.

Patton classifies regional models into three groups: (1) Openness of the region. Here the growth that is analyzed depends on influence from outside. Best known of models in this group is the economic base model in which export industries have to be developed first and urban growth follows later. (2) Closed models, in which the growth occurs internally. These follow the pattern of older economic models of the growth of the entire country. Such models reach a threshold, followed by a chain of accelerated and specialized growth. Diversified industries then replace specialized industries, but the rate of acceleration slows down. Nonetheless, growth is self-sustaining, from the point in time when the threshold is reached. (3) A synthesis of (1) and (2). These are popular now and one of
them is called the growth pole model. One industry, textiles for example, stimulates the region. Another is the growth center model, in which a small or medium sized city has a potential for stimulation capable of causing the whole area to experience extreme growth.

Patton's dissertation reconciles the analytical limitations of economics with a long-period study. Brought up in Reading, he became curious about the commonly accepted statement, attributed to historian George Albright and others, that "the railroad made Reading." In 1838, when the railroad first came to Reading, the only industry there was hat making, although the city was a junction for the Schuylkill and Union canals. The canals had made it a center for warehousing, and canal maintenance had provided a certain degree of economic stimulation. By 1910 Reading had reached its apex, with a population of 90,000 and ten industries each with value-added of one million dollars. The Reading Railroad was third among the ten.

The market effect of the railroad had two distinct characteristics, each from different periods of Reading's development. Immediately following 1838 the rails ran parallel to the canal system and there was intense rivalry between the two transportation systems. From 1860 to 1910 the railroads branched out and formed links with major national railroads. In the first period Reading's trade could move only east and west along the rails paralleling the Union Canal, between Reading and Harrisburg, and from northwest to southwest on the line that ran between Pottsville and Philadelphia. At that time only Philadelphia could generate adequate manufactured products for Reading's needs. Thus the relationship of Reading to Philadelphia was one of colonialism. The effect of the railroad at this point was really to reinforce the existing hegemony of Philadelphia over the Delaware and Schuylkill valleys. Between 1859 and 1874 the railroad built branch lines from Reading, intending to maintain its monopoly on anthracite shipments in southeastern Pennsylvania. This action was necessitated by new rivals, the New York Central and the Pennsylvania Railroad. The branches were also intended to cut down on Reading's dependence on Philadelphia. Dependence on Philadelphia for manufactured items was solved by the natural growth of manufacturing within Reading. By 1880 Reading had several home industries that had acquired national reputation, the most famous of which was Luddens Candy. The enlarged rail system enabled them to ship to customers all over the nation, rather than depending on Philadelphia business to handle
anything intended for a national market. A further advantage was that resources for the city's own industries could be drawn from a much wider area.

In the 1830s Reading leaders launched a media campaign to attract industry. They were especially anxious to attract textile manufacturers and iron enterprisers, two groups which had high growth potential. But they could not then offer anything to these businesses that their neighboring cities were not also offering.

The establishment of railroad shops in Reading caused the city's greatest change. Why in Reading? Patton is not absolutely certain, but he mentioned that Reading capitalists had owned twenty per cent of the railroad's capital stock and had invested heavily to get it started. He suspects that some form of bargain took place between city interests and persons empowered to determine the site of the shops.

The railroad shops became Reading's largest industry. Also, they acted as a catalyst to catapult Reading's growth. They attracted skilled labor from surrounding counties. Thus there was an initial period of in-migration, although it was followed by a contrasting trend toward promotion from within the ranks of those already working in the shops. Many who began by working in the shops broke loose to found their own businesses. Cyrus T. Fox's Reading and Berks County Pennsylvania: A History (1952), which has biographies of about 100 industrial leaders, indicates that about 25 of these men founded other businesses after beginning life in the shops. Eleven of the twenty-five started businesses related to the machine oriented railroad repair work. Other businesses began to rise near Reading once the shops were established. The railroad provided specific incentive by giving free land to businesses locating along the lines and close to Reading. Mostly these were iron works and machinery shops. Two such iron shops and two machinery shops founded in this manner were eventually bought out by the railroad and formed into a second corporation which was controlled by a directory that interlocked with the railroad.

The shops also had a showpiece effect. Promotional literature made it appear that Reading was a model for business progress and the shops were the principal example advanced to give that impression. There was no other city in southeastern Pennsylvania so impressive until the growth of Bethlehem Steel in the 1870s.

From the 1830s to the 1870s Reading's industry was highly specialized in machine tools and related iron products. From the
1870s to 1910 the city's rate of growth was slower and its industries were more diversified. Among the ten million-dollar industries of 1910 were tobacco, candy, hat making, and woolen goods. The presence of the railroad was not the direct cause of this diversification. Patton believes that the factors that created diversification included the presence of resources not needed by the railroad-machinery complex, and the residential persistence of the Pennsylvania German population. The railroad did, however, make a broad market available for those non-mechanical industries.

Returning to the subject of regional effect, Patton compared Reading with Lebanon, Norristown, and Lancaster. Using local histories and census data he concluded that the railroad's role in the rivalry of these four was insignificant. In fact, Reading can best be described as having a lack of the disadvantages that held back the others, rather than any positive advantages. Lebanon's growth was prevented by its situation between Harrisburg and Reading, by its relative inaccessibility, and by its association with the surrounding poor rural county. It could never become competitive. Although Lebanon had once had railroad shops, Reading and Harrisburg took these away. Norristown was in a situation of perpetual rivalry with Pottstown, Conchohocken, and other surrounding small cities, none of which established even local hegemony. Lancaster had had a period of industrial growth preceding Reading's (before 1838), but growth had slowed down because Lancaster's business became enslaved to servicing the highly productive surrounding agricultural area. Thus Lancaster had no incentive to engage in heavy industry. Reading, too, was located in an agricultural county, but not one as productive as Lancaster County. Census data for 1910 show that manufacturing interests that left Lancaster in the first decade of the twentieth century included tobacco, textiles, umbrella making, and cane manufacturing.

In conclusion, Patton said that Reading's conformity to model (2) can be attributed to the railroad in the sense that the railroad made Reading develop in the manner in which it did. To the economist Patton's study shows that historical tools of regional analysis can be used effectively, applying the existing historical data. It cannot be used as elegantly as most economists would prefer, but it can be used.

In the discussion period that followed Mahlon H. Hellerich commented on comparisons with the history of Allentown, stressing the importance of local banks in economic growth patterns, and of the
role the railroad played there. For many reasons, including psychological association, railroads fostered the iron industry, he said. Homer T. Rosenberger commented that the decision to place railroad shops in Reading was based on the farsighted assumption that the anthracite industry would eventually expand into the south-eastern Pennsylvania region.

The final session which was chaired by John E. Bodnar dealt with the importance of genealogy to the historian. John Joseph Stoudt, a research associate at Haverford College, was the first speaker. Defining history as the usable past, he distinguished between history that is the bedrock facts produced by research (res gestae), and that which involves interpretation (historia rerum gestarum). Genealogy is bedrock history, but family history is interpretive. There are two types of genealogy: sippenkunde which is the tracing of the descendants of an individual, usually a noted feudal or royal male, and ahnenkunde which is the tracing of the ancestors of a contemporary individual. Using his son John's ahnenkunde for illustrative purposes, Stoudt discussed five points which he called "surs" (irrational elements). The surs of numbers for the Stoudt family shows that they had over one and one-half million ancestors in 1370, a figure exceeding the total population of Europe. The family name itself dates from about 1530, the period of the Peasant Revolt in Germany. The Stoudts, like most families today, are descended from peasant stock. Only after being freed from serfdom can they be said to have had a true surname. The second surd covers characteristics of the family. He emphasized that the ancient Roman pater familias system seems to have survived into modern times. To prove this he compared a description of a Roman household with the 1790 census description of the George Schaeffer household, a collateral line of the Stoudt family. Since they seemed so similar Stoudt argued that the current conception of family did not arise until the twentieth century. The third surd, geography, was simply illustrated by the statement that the Stoudts and related lines came from numerous countries of western Europe. The fourth surd, social class status, could not be covered by any simple statement in the case of the Stoudts, because their ancestors ranged from the most honorable professions to some of the most dishonorable of livelihoods. The fifth surd is that of illegitimacy. It is important for accurate identification of bloodlines, but genealogy always assumes legitimacy. This, too, he illustrated by anecdotes from his own family. Illegitimacy's occurrence is largely known only from personal statements, not from written sources.
William W. Hummel of Albright College has also used his own family genealogy. He has studied his hometown, Espy, in Columbia County, during the 1930s. A few years ago he became interested in the subject after making a casual remark to his wife that Espy no longer had any reality for him. Trying to decide why he had come to think that way, he began to assemble and organize information about the family. Since memories of his boyhood are still strong, it was not an arduous research chore. His forebears began to inhabit Espy during the Civil War, all arriving from not too distant areas of eastern Pennsylvania. By 1880 all his great-grandparents lived in or near Espy. At the time of his birth, 1923, Hummel had 45 or 50 relatives in the town, about six per cent of the population. Using a street map he showed how close their residences had been to each other. The Hummel family situation was similar to other Espy families and, in fact, distant ties of relationship to the Hummels could be traced throughout the entire county.

The strength of families shaped social life. Most social functions were family gatherings in which the time was largely spent in pruning the family tree and straightening the cemetery. Authority was very effective in the schools because the families supported it. A school child seldom questioned the instruction he received because the family would soon learn of it if he did.

Because of the strong family characteristic, Espy was largely untouched by the depression of the 1930s. No bank closures occurred because depositors were always unwilling to engage in a run on a bank that was operated by their kinsmen. Paternalism prevailed and there was very little unemployment. Voluntary associations which, in urban areas, were a notable failure in providing depression relief, were very successful in Espy. Also, residents who had retired in the 1920s on as little as $8,000 to $12,000 in savings remained largely unharmed by the depression. The Espy situation suggests that for much of the country's population loss of identity begins after World War II, not during the great depression.

Randolph S. Klein of Connecticut College spoke concerning the importance of using genealogy to gain a full understanding of family life and kinship. He had relied heavily on genealogical research in writing his Portrait of An American Family; The Shippens of Pennsylvania Across Five Generations (1975). The Shippens, especially in alliance with the related families of Allens and Hamiltons, were very powerful before the Revolution. They were so strong in the Philadelphia Common Council that they were often able to choose the mayor.
A major goal of many American revolutionaries was the overthrow of the existing system of favoritism through kinship, which was part of the Shippen tradition. In this sense the Revolution was more a social than a political upheaval. In addition to its contribution toward such major works as Portrait of An American Family, genealogy is useful to stimulate the historical curiosity of college students. Once they have worked on their own family genealogies they may develop a desire to solve broader questions through historical inquiry. Klein mentioned the growth of the anonymous family history collection at the University of Minnesota. Some day it will be a major center for primary source material for historians.

Chairman John E. Bodnar commented on the three papers. The key to making family history important, he said, is to make it relevant to whatever else was going on at the time the family existed. Our goal is to learn how families actually functioned. Stoudt's reference to the persistence of the ancient Roman family pattern reminded him of the stem families of southeastern Europe. There peasant families were very functional. Sons were definitely tied down to the will of their elders because the inheritance they stood to acquire, the farm land, was essential for livelihood. Hummel's story of Espy in the 1930s also reminds us that there are other ways in which the perpetuated kinship system has benefited its members. In late nineteenth-century Europe the family was in trouble because the continuous division of land over generations had reached a point where further subdivision, by inheritance, was impractical. Families that emigrated to the United States found a surrogate for landed estates, in the form of inherited jobs and homes. Bodnar’s research into the steelworkers' districts of the south side of Pittsburgh has shown him that from the 1920s forward it was often the case that the only way a young man could find employment in a steel mill was through the influence of a father who had worked there many years. It is ironic, he feels, that the prosperity of recent decades which has brought new employment criteria—labor union membership and skilled credentials—appears to be a social advance, but has had an adverse effect on the generally respected institution of the family. The surrogate estate is no longer there to hold the family together.

In the discussion period John M. Coleman commented to Randolph Klein concerning the apparent ease with which Philadelphia loyalists had been able to return to positions of respectability following the Revolution. Loring B. Priest commented on William Hummel's address with remarks about other Pennsylvania small
towns in which there was also a high degree of interrelationship.

The conference concluded with a dinner at Castiglio's restaurant for which the Association graciously thanked its host, the Historical and Museum Commission.

ARF! ARF!

The vast number of dogs in this city have been long justly regarded as a very great nuisance. The fierceness of many of them renders it dangerous to pass the streets. Some of them are suffered to roam about at large, although their owners know they indiscriminately bite every person that approaches them.

A very worthy lad was this morning bit by a dog in Chestnut street. I sent to have the dangerous animal shot, but the owner prevented it, although it was confessed he had bit a man about a month since. Heavens! can any man of common humanity balance between the life of an innocent fellow creature and that of a biting dog? Surely not....

As the committee of ways and means will be under necessity of recurring to every proper object of taxation, I beg leave to recommend a tax upon dogs. Five sixths of them are totally unnecessary. The tax would therefore fall upon a superfluity, and would tend to lessen their number, and consequently the danger arising from them.

[Pennsylvania Herald, and General Advertiser, 13 December 1786]