find a useful reference here, whether the topic is social, political, military, economic, or even environmental. They can also relate these issues to broader themes in United States history. These volumes should sit on the shelves of every major public and college library in the state.

MICHAEL P. GABRIEL
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania


There never has been a book like this in the field of colonial/revolutionary American history, and unless a large team of researchers is gathered, there will never be one like it again. Professors Marietta and Rowe have looked at every surviving record of crime (and much more) in Pennsylvania at the colony/state, county, and local levels for a period of over a hundred years, some 75,000 cases. This is not a sample – this is everything that survives. And they have presented it in a manner that uses statistics and computer-generated data in an easy-to-understand manner as the base for a literate book that will forever change the way we think about early Pennsylvania. Yes, Pennsylvania avoided war for its first three-quarters of a century; but it did not avoid violence and crime, in fact it was riddled with them. The Quaker reluctance to use force meant a society where there was much more crime per capita than notorious London at the time, not to mention rigorous Massachusetts, the politically much more contentious colony of New York, and what we know of the South.

The great paradox at the heart of this book is that with crime, as with the outbreak of war on the Pennsylvania frontier after 1754, Pennsylvania was a victim of its own virtues and good intentions. William Penn and the founding Quakers hoped to prove that a diverse population of ordinary folk could be governed with a light hand, but by the 1720s disappointment with this system led to harsher penalties and enforcement that came to resemble the other colonies. With the American Revolution, idealism returned, and once again Pennsylvania led the world in new ways of dealing with crime – rehabilitation that focused on gaining the criminal’s mental acceptance of
society rather than punishment of the body to compel obedience. Of course, as the rise in crime in the 1790s showed, and the nineteenth century would demonstrate even more graphically, these hopes too would be dashed.

Furthermore, the nature of the criminals causes us to rethink both the nature and population of Pennsylvania, and — by extension — early American society. Most crimes were committed by people who appear on no other records — they were not taxpayers, they were not recognized inhabitants of a community, and while they must have been born and died somewhere (and in many cases married and had children), it did not appear on Pennsylvania records. (Marietta checked.) In short, there were thousands of people — poor people — roaming around Pennsylvania or staying put and remaining invisible — a society with greater extremes of class and wealth distribution than scholars who limit their analysis (as nearly everyone has) to tax, local, militia, and religious records can discover.

Regional variations, variations over time, ethnic, racial and gender differences, suicide, sodomy, bestiality, and infanticide along with riots, theft, murder, and assault, any question or topic that a historian might ask about Pennsylvania crime is answered as precisely as possible in this marvelous book. Marietta and Rowe compare crime rates with other colonies and Britain; they are familiar with scholarship on Native Americans, African-Americans, servants, the poor, women, rioters, and the elite and integrate other scholars’ findings with their own, with other colonies’ crime rates and distribution by group, giving generous credit where due. Attention is paid as well to discussions of crime by political figures, penal reformers, literature, diaries, newspapers, and personal papers. In an age of scholarship where analysis of people’s emotions and discourses are in vogue, it is nice to have the sort of history where questions such as who, what, where, when, and how are answered rather than suggested, and where research is not limited to a community or person supposed to be representative of more than it/him/herself. Comparing Marietta’s work with Douglas Greenberg’s history of crime in New York and William Nelson’s and David Flaherty’s work on Massachusetts—the best empirical studies of colonial crime thus far—reveals a greater depth of research and sophistication of interpretation.

I should also like to address the Epilogue of the book. Here, Marietta brings his research up (or down) to date. Prosperity in Pennsylvania and America has been a blessing for many, but for those excluded it has been a temptation and justification for crime. Furthermore, the nation, like early Pennsylvania, has veered between liberal idealism and harsh punishment in a
never-ending and rarely successful effort to deal with crime perceived primarily as a product of poverty and ethnic readjustment rather than the logical consequence of societal injustice. It may be premature to call a book a classic at the moment it is published, but I am willing to take that chance. Marietta’s book will astonish scholars both with its interpretation and the depth of research that supports it. It is as definitive as any work of human scholarship could possibly be.

WILLIAM PENCAK
The Pennsylvania State University


Andrew Schocket has noted that Alexis de Tocqueville’s infatuation with the power and vitality of the new democratic institutions of the United States in the early 1830s, blinded him to the emergence of an equally vital new economic power, the public corporation. Tocqueville saw the traditional political and economic elite of the colonial period as marginalized and resentful of their banishment from the political scene. Schocket demonstrates that, far from being impotent, the old Philadelphia Quaker commercial and social elite, invigorated by the addition of successful entrepreneurs, developed a new style of urban leadership that enabled them to continue directing much of the development of both Philadelphia and Pennsylvania. This elite saw itself as a natural aristocracy blessed with the talent and vision lacking in the contentious members of the state legislature. These leaders attempted to solve difficult problems and economic needs that “the state was unwilling to fulfill,” simultaneously enriching both the commonwealth and themselves. To avoid interference by democratic governments which they viewed as given to irrational excesses, inefficiencies, and hostility towards the free market, this elite “imported a British institution, the corporation, and used it to build a base of power from which to formulate and enact economic policies more to their likings than to those of state legislatures.”

Advocates of the chartered public corporation believed that such an institution would allow them to guide economic growth and thus integrate the disparate communities of a state divided by geographic, religious, and