

BOOK REVIEWS

Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675–1715. By RICHARD R. JOHNSON. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1981. xx, 470 p. Bibliography, maps, index. \$30.00.)

This excellent study examines the development of political institutions in New England during an era of greater and more far reaching changes than in any previous period of the region's history. Due to the transitional nature of this period, two conflicting models of political motivation have emerged. Was the concept of political authority based upon the premise of a self contained Puritan leadership with its eyes fixed upon the glory of the early years of the new Jerusalem (and the hereafter), or was influence shifting to prototypical Yankees who were becoming willing participants in an expanding and prosperous Atlantic community? Professor Johnson's thesis suggests that in fact the two models of authority were merged as New England accepted a historic accommodation which brought political institutions into closer conformity with English ways yet retained much of the unique heritage that differentiated the region from the rest of British North America.

The author argues that the events of the Glorious Revolution prompted a creative synthesis which not only influenced the economic and religious structure of New England, but initiated a period of political stability lasting for three quarters of a century, a substantial proportion of the period of European settlement in America. This thesis is based on an investigation of the evolution of an increasingly sophisticated trans-Atlantic relationship from the imposition of Dominion rule to the final tremors of the Glorious Revolution. Thus economic issues, military campaigns and property disputes are examined in the context of their impact on the expansion of the political horizon. Successful political leadership is measured on the basis of ability to mediate between the conflicting desires and interests of English officials seeking greater colonial dependence and colonists accustomed to a decisive role in government.

Johnson argues convincingly that this political accommodation was not a melodrama of visible saints trapped in a web of royal imperialism and mercantilist greed, but a tenable solution to the political instability, military vulnerability and economic uncertainty which plagued early New England society.

The concept of creative accommodation is most effectively developed in the consideration of the negotiation, attempted restoration, and final alteration

of Massachusetts charter government. Johnson creates a fascinating interweaving of developments in the policy making centers in Boston and London that is highlighted by the amalgamation of religious idealism and political and economic opportunism. Thus we see Increase Mather taking a scholar's delight in planning a campaign for penetrating the mysteries of English colonial administration while his passionate belief in the slow unfolding of New England's purpose permits convenient alliance with a Catholic James, a Dutch William and an Anglican Parliament without missing an ideological step. Massachusetts agent Sir Henry Ashurst notes the "heavenly reward" expected for his services yet does not hesitate to remind the General Court of the £300 awarded to the agent of a smaller (and less godly) colony. Samuel Sewall bemoans the "high handed wickedness" of licentious games and fashions imported into Boston as he notes the concurrent expansion of his assets during this "wicked era." These vignettes flesh out the cautious accommodation of colonial leaders as opposition to compromise as self betrayal of the "New England Way" gives way to a rather cheerful willingness to grease the appropriate wheels of Westminster and Whitehall for colonial and personal benefit.

The thorough analysis of Massachusetts developments tends to weaken the prospect of a truly comparative regional study. Political events in neighboring colonies seem to appear as a side show to the main arena of the Bay Colony. Notwithstanding this minor problem, Johnson has produced a comprehensive and very satisfactory survey of a transitional period in New England history.

Villanova University

VICTOR D. BROOKS

The Journal of the Proceedings of the President, 1793-1797. Edited by DOROTHY TWOHIG. In *The Papers of George Washington*. W. W. ABBOT, Editor. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1981. xvii, 393 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$25.00.)

This document chronicles proceedings within the executive branch from just prior to the start of George Washington's second term as President of the United States in 1793 through its conclusion in 1797. Issues upon which Washington devoted considerable attention during these years include foreign relations, particularly with revolutionary France; Indian affairs, particularly in the Northwest Territory; the development of the Federal City, particularly the personnel problems; and such routine actions as signing patents and congressional bills, granting pardons, and making appointments. Entries for 1793 are detailed and include extensive summaries of letters

received by cabinet members and submitted to the President for his information or decision. From 1794 to its conclusion the journal consists primarily of references to documents signed by the President. The trained eye, often aided by the editor, will gain insight into such matters as precedent setting in the young Republic, congressional-executive politics, the genius of American inventiveness, federal policy in the 1780s, and Washington's administrative style. Washington's diaries for these years, which would flesh out the *Journal*, are largely non-extant, and the *Journal* must stand in their place.

Responsibility for editing *The Papers of George Washington* is shared by several individuals. The editor for this volume is Dorothy Twohig, an historian whose knowledge of the documents and events of the United States during the last decade of the eighteenth century is probably unsurpassed. Her annotation is complete without being so extensive as to interpret the document. Only rarely is the reader left without adequate guidance: what is the Communication Book mentioned on page 37? Considering the value of the document to administrative history, such an administrative aberration as the inclusion of information from Washington's private correspondence with a friend, Commissioner of the Federal City David Stuart, bears explanation.

The editorial apparatus is generally clean and sufficient to the demands of a text laden with references to documents widely scattered among the public papers of the federal government and the private papers of the men who recommended action to Congress and carried out its mandates. The *Journal's* focus on the military affairs of the West demands a map locating the forts, battles, and treaty sites so often mentioned. While three paragraphs in the "editorial Apparatus" shed light on the nature of the *Journal* and its value, the most disappointing aspect of the volume is the absence of a separate, introductory essay (like, but shorter than, that employed by the editors of the *Diaries*). Is there a relationship between this document and the evolution of the cabinet? Was it not possible to identify who, other than Tobias Lear and Bartholomew Dandridge, made entries in the *Journal* in Washington's name? Is there any evidence from 1789-1792, other than by inference from the extant *Diaries*, that Washington considered keeping a similar record of his first administration?

First Federal Congress Project

KENNETH R. BOWLING

Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Freedom, 1822-1832. Volume II. By ROBERT V. REMINI. (New York: Harper & Row, 1981. xvi, 469 p. Chronology, illustrations, index. \$20.00.)

At one level in this second of a projected three volume study of Andrew Jackson will be found a thoroughly researched account of a major part of the

career of one of America's "strong" presidents — from his retirement as governor of Florida through his reelection to the beginnings of the nullification crisis with South Carolina. Included, therefore, are accounts of Jackson's re-entry into politics, his presidential boom, his failure to be elected in 1824-1825, the organization of the Democratic party, his election after the sordid campaign of 1828, the formation of his administration, and his efforts to advance his program of "reform." There are excellent discussions of Jackson the man, with all his attendant personal problems, and the people about him — Van Buren, Kendall, Blair, and especially his wife Rachel, whose influence was "enormous" (p.10), and many others. All of this is presented in the style we have come to expect from Remini: lively, exciting, dramatic, witty, and forceful, the last particularly applicable to his judgment of Jackson himself. Not uncritically, Remini leaves no doubt that he admires Jackson, seeing him always at the center, always in command — an effective politician, an "outstanding administrator" (p. 217), and sensitive to the currents of his times. For Jackson, Remini would enthusiastically support E. H. Carr's notable general statement that "he [had] a qualified power to break the chain [of causation] at a given point — the present — and so alter the future." For example, Remini notes: "The American presidency came of age with the arrival of General Jackson in the White House" and that Jackson "assisted in the conversion of a republic into a democracy" (pp. 229, 324).

By far the most compelling feature of this account (one which Remini — after years of research in this period — presents with a genuine sense of discovery) is the central, integrating thesis. Remini argues that the so-called "Era of Good Feelings" — the Monroe years — might better be characterized as "America's first Era of Corruption" (p. ix) and that Jackson reentered politics and performed as he did to clean up the "mess" in Washington. Through retrenchment and reform (including rotation in office, reducing the role of the national government, and promoting economy), he sought to bring the country back to the principles of the Founding Fathers from which it had strayed. To this end, Jackson supported the Jeffersonian credo in opposition to the reincarnation of Hamiltonianism in Clay's American System. Therefore, Remini "presumes to argue a revisionist interpretation both of [his] subject and the era that bears his name. [He] offers a thesis that seeks to identify and define Jackson's unique contribution to American political history during the first half of the nineteenth century" and notes that Jackson helped to produce "the first conscious effort at political reform in American history" (p. ix). Jackson, Remini continues, "a man of republican principle and purpose . . . devised a program of reform by which he believed he could best protect and perpetuate the liberty of the American people" (p. x).

Remini's favorable assessment, so forcefully presented, will — as would be the case with any presidential biography — provoke discussion, to say the least. Was his Bank of the United States veto, for example, "the most important veto ever issued by a President" (p. 369)? But the volume is thoroughly researched and highly readable. Most significantly, the author has attempted to link basic eighteenth-century republican ideas to the more superficial details of presidential political behavior. This is political biography at its provocative best.

Allentown

JOHN J. REED

The Free Black in Urban America, 1800–1850: The Shadow of the Dream. By LEONARD P. CURRY. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981. xix, 346 p. Maps, tables, appendices, bibliography, index. \$25.00.)

In 1899, W. E. B. DuBois noted in *The Philadelphia Negro* that the antebellum black population of that city was of special importance because in 1810 they constituted "the largest percent of the population they have ever attained." That eleven percent was, of course, long before the twentieth-century migration, but that statistic is a clue to the significance of this neglected aspect of both black and urban history. Happily, Leonard Curry's detailed study of life in fifteen cities helps fill that void, at least down to the last prewar decade. The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 so disrupted black community patterns that the author thought it appropriate to conclude the study just as railroads, industrialization and immigration were transforming cities.

It is impossible to summarize the blizzard of statistics, facts and smaller interpretive points. The book is rather mechanical in its organization, with chapters on population, occupation, housing, poverty, health, churches and other predictable topics. Within each chapter, the city-by-city discussion makes the index the least useful portion of the book. Herein lies the most disquieting feature of the book. It attempts to compare fifteen cities, and it does a capable job of pointing out their similarities and contrasts on a dozen subject areas. But one wishes that the author had plugged his discussion into a wider urban context, comparing such factors as the speed of urban growth, transportation patterns, ethnic diversity, primordial industrialization, state educational traditions and others. While such explanations would probably have resulted in a larger (and more expensive) book, it ultimately would have been more satisfying for the urban historian. Conclusions at the ends of the chapters and the book are also very weak, often consisting of little more than platitudes.

Despite these problems, those interested in Philadelphia's black history will find Curry's book of great value. That city had not only the largest black population in any free state, but its black community also enjoyed the oldest set of associations, the most outstanding individual leaders in Absalom Jones and Richard Allen and an extensive educational system supported by the Quakers after 1732. Discrimination and poor support for public education also led to a strong tradition of proprietary schools. Like other cities, Philadelphia witnessed the development of a separate black church system after 1780 and the loss in 1836 of black voting rights. The latter sparked perhaps the loudest ante-bellum rights protest. Black Philadelphians also faced problems of disease, poor housing in dilapidated alleys and intense and often violent competition for jobs by the growing immigrant population. Scattered through the volume is rich documentation of ante-bellum black Philadelphia.

There is, however, an odd omission in the failure to cite any of the outstanding research findings on the subject produced by Theodore Hershberg and the Philadelphia Social History Project. Hershberg utilizes quantitative data with great skill, though his statistical analyses lack the human character of Curry's work. Hershberg also places great emphasis on distinguishing the experience of ex-slaves from those born free, a dimension not given proper treatment in Curry's work.

But despite these shortcomings, *The Free Black in Urban America* is a work of major importance that will be read with interest for decades.

The University of Illinois at Chicago

PERRY R. DUIS

The American Daguerreotype. By FLOYD RINHART and MARION RINHART. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1981. x, 446 p. Illustrations, appendices, index. \$65.00.)

This book grew out of an important photograph collection brought together by dedicated people. Unfortunately many of those who are at their best spotting scuffed leather daguerreotype cases at Sunday-dawn fleamarkets are at their worst writing about the contents of those cases. This volume thus offers an unintended demonstration of the difference between connoisseurship and scholarship. The Rinharts' most significant contribution will always be their collection of daguerreotypes, now at the Ohio State University at Columbus. An illustrated catalogue of that collection with a bibliography of contemporary sources would have more lasting value than this large, relatively unprocessed compilation of images, quotations, and comments. *The American Daguerreotype* more closely resembles the tables of a remarkable

feamarket than a historical statement.

Nonetheless, there is no shortage of important factual detail. Illustrations from relevant United States patents are reproduced as are the versos of daguerreotype plates bearing evidence of various procedures. A large illustrated section on color photography goes farther than any previous account. Casemakers and platemakers get their due. An appendix tabulates hallmarks found on plates. And thirty-six pages listing daguerreans and providing brief biographical information will prove useful. The sheer volume of raw information at least gives this book value as a reference.

Beaumont Newhall's *The Daguerreotype in America*, a briefer work which first appeared over twenty years ago, remains the bedrock of the field. Not all of the books on the subject published since 1961 fall short. But we can safely generalize that publishers aiming to take advantage of a market for photography books have proven that they cannot be counted on for discrimination. Back in 1938, when a book on American photography was hardly assured a large public, the Macmillan Company published Robert Taft's *Photography and the American Scene*. All things considered, a more thorough and responsible account has not appeared since. Perhaps the sixty-five dollar price on the Rinharts' book signals the end of an irresponsible era in publishing.

Much of the recent publication and exhibition boom has not advanced the history of photography. A closer look at the field may be instructive. The first history of photography appeared in Marcus Aurelius Root's *The Camera and the Pencil* (Philadelphia, 1864). Written after more than 60,000 sitters had passed through the studio of this drawing master-turned-daguerrean at 5th and Chestnut Streets, the book was a futile attempt to justify a technology already being surpassed by paper photography. Although the daguerreotype was the superior photographic product, it was expensive, difficult to view, cumbersome and unique. Root felt the end at hand and set out to collect stories concerning the introduction of the daguerreotype in Philadelphia.

Root reproduced Joseph Saxton's daguerreotype, the earliest surviving American plate, made from the United States Mint at Chestnut and Juniper Streets in mid-October, 1839. He listed the men who, by virtue of their scientific and artistic inclinations, made daguerreotypes that same season. "Philadelphia savants began cultivating the art," wrote Root, "among those were Robert Cornelius, Drs. Paul Beck Goddard, Parker, Bird and Kennedy, Professors John Frazer, and Walter R. Johnson, William G. Mason, engraver, Dr. Wildman and many others." This list, now nearly 120 years old, is a generous gift to historians. And though it is no secret from them, it has remained relatively unexploited.

One of Root's cosmic winks was his mention of Walter Rogers Johnson,

the Harvard-trained chemist, physicist, geologist and educator. He was allowed five inches in the 1888 *Cyclopedia of American Biography*, but was nowhere to be found in the *Dictionary of American Biography* forty years later. Taft resurrected Johnson in 1938, and Newhall reproduced one of his plates for the first time. No publication since has advanced Johnson's record.

Good fortune has recently brought to light some of Johnson's photographic activities during the autumn of 1839. At Wyck, the house-museum in Germantown, is a previously unknown Johnson daguerreotype of the house and several pertinent letters. Reuben Haines, whose home it was, had brought Johnson to Pennsylvania to head the Germantown Academy in 1821. By 1839 Johnson was at the University of Pennsylvania and maintained close ties with the Haines family. When the French government made the daguerreotype public in 1839, Johnson was in Europe. He returned with a camera and proceeded to perfect his skills as a daguerrean.

Though a dramatic example, Johnson's slipping away from the magic circle of history is the unappealing truth. Is it an accident, a lone and extraordinary example? Of the early daguerreans listed by Root, only Cornelius is well studied. What is the real effect of today's photography "boom"? What will be the eventual outcome of media-sensitive museums and auction houses, flamboyant exhibitions and hasty publications? Clearly more care, thought, persistence and intelligence is needed in the history of photography. More history is needed, and less hype.

The Library Company of Philadelphia

KENNETH FINKEL

Waldo Emerson. By GAY WILSON ALLEN. (New York: Viking Press, 1981. xviii, 751 p. Illustrations, chronology, genealogy, index. \$25.00.)

In *Waldo Emerson*, a weighty new biography of the Concord sage, Gay Wilson Allen presents a somewhat different view of Emerson than we are accustomed to seeing. Emerson had an unpromising childhood; he was a poor scholar, his achievements overshadowed by those of his more brilliant brothers William, Charles, and Edward. An undergraduate at Harvard, he defiantly requested his family and friends to call him Waldo Emerson, in reference to his Waldensian ancestors who had fled to England to escape persecution in seventeenth century Europe. Allen points out Emerson's uncertainty in choosing a career; like Henry David Thoreau later, he felt a "paucity of alternatives." Feeling pressured to follow in his father's footsteps and become a minister, Emerson's intellectual malaise manifested itself in a series of physical illnesses. Emerson's youth and early adult life were rocked by family illnesses and tragedies, especially the deaths of his father, his first

wife Ellen, his brothers Charles and Edward, and his beloved first son Waldo.

As a matter of fact, Emerson truly did not "find himself" until he repudiated the Unitarian church at the age of twenty-nine, unable to conscientiously administer communion. Allen very concretely details the struggle between the persistence of Emerson's Unitarian — and Puritan — heritage (he was ordained as junior pastor of the Second Church in Boston, once presided over by Increase Mather and his son Cotton) and Emerson's ideas of what he came to call "the infinitude of the private man." We see the evolution of Emerson's intellectual growth from sermons preaching God-reliance to essays stating the principles of self-reliance. Renouncing the faith of his Unitarian fathers in the monumental "Divinity School Address" of 1838 was a prerequisite to Emerson's independence.

The strength of Allen's book lies in its full and precise chronicling of Emerson's personal life through his correspondence and writings and various others' written accounts. He has marshalled impressive research into this long-overdue biography of Emerson, the first since 1949. Allen's treatment demonstrates a grasp of Emerson's place in the intellectual excitement of the time and sketches a number of expressive portraits of contemporaries such as Bronson Alcott, Margaret Fuller, Thoreau, Jones Very, and Caroline Sturgis.

Allen conveys well the intimacy and small scale of Boston and Concord society. In Concord, the Emerson family lived for years in the "Old Manse" later rented by neighbors Nathaniel and Sophia Hawthorne; Emerson bought property on Walden Pond, on which he later let Thoreau build a cabin; and he was tangentially involved in George Ripley's experiment in communal living, Brook Farm. The author cites the coming and going of a prodigious number of notable guests at the Emerson household (despite the common characterization of Emerson as cold, lofty, and unreachable). Emerson lived a long life; having fought his battles in youth, his later life was serene. He gained the acceptance of society and apparently enjoyed it.

In the delineation of Emerson's ideas, Allen is not as successful, perhaps because they do not respond well to a linear treatment. The various influences on Emerson — diverse as Plato's idealism, the Persian poets' theories of aesthetic inebriation, and the "inner light" of the Hicksite Quakers — are all explicated through paraphrases of Emerson's writings. However, Emerson's essays are better than the philosophical ideas contained in them. We do not see the immensity of Emerson's thought or where the power of the essays lies. Allen's analysis seems, in this sense, to harken back to a time before F.O. Matthiessen, who showed the force to reside not in the theory but in the form of Emerson's essays. Throughout the biography Allen has Emerson

“anticipating” the work of people from Freud to Amy Lowell. In doing so, Allen leaves unanswered the question of what about Emerson’s work influenced the thought of others and has made him not only the “strongest moral and literary personality of his generation” but a seminal figure whose influence stretches into our own time.

Lansdowne, Pennsylvania

JOANNE E. FRASER

The Union Cavalry in the Civil War: Volume II, The War in the East From Gettysburg to Appomattox, 1863–1865. By STEPHEN Z. STARR. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981. xv, 526 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. \$30.00.)

The earlier volume of Stephen Z. Starr’s projected trilogy on the Union army’s cavalry was largely a chronicle of ineptitude, as it followed the mishaps of an army lacking a cavalry tradition but attempting to forge a mounted arm in the midst of war. Yet there was a paradoxical lightheartedness about the volume; Union cavalry soldiers throughout the first part of the war often remained rowdy, blustering, frequently drunken, indisciplined, high-spirited, overgrown boys, savoring a great adventure. They could remain light-hearted partly because there was more than a little truth in the infantry’s jibe, “Who ever saw a dead cavalryman?” Ineptitude kept action and therefore casualties limited.

In this, Starr’s second volume, the paradox reverses itself. Molded by good leaders into an effective military force at last, the cavalry rode to one battlefield triumph after another, finally dooming the enemy’s Army of Northern Virginia to surrender at Appomattox by closing the last route of retreat westward. But the prevailing tone of the volume is one of melancholy. The sight of a dead cavalryman was no longer rare. At Five Forks on April 1, 1865, Philadelphia’s 6th Pennsylvania Cavalry — the men who had gone off to war under the romantic regimental sobriquet of Rush’s Lancers — could put only forty-eight troopers into line, where the tables of organization called for about 1,000. The next day, Major General Wesley Merritt assigned the survivors to his headquarters as an escort, because the 6th Pennsylvania had shrunk too badly to return to the battle line.

Of course, this regiment that had ridden to war under Colonel Richard H. Rush — son of John Quincy Adams’s minister to England — exemplified not simply large casualties per se, but an extreme form of the consequences of a policy of inadequate replenishment of veteran formations. If its fate had been altogether typical, there would have been no Cavalry Corps left in the Army of the Potomac to contribute decisively to the Appomattox campaign.

Nevertheless, the heavy casualties of the 6th Pennsylvania were typical enough that they have an importance for Starr's book beyond fostering an elegiac tone that makes the volume often poignant and moving.

Conventional wisdom among recent military historians — this reviewer included — has held that by the time of the Civil War, cavalry was useful only in auxiliary, peripheral roles. Reasonably well-trained infantry equipped with the newly standard rifled musket could supposedly break any mounted charge, so the cavalry had to be confined to reconnaissance, flank security, and raiding. When cavalry fought infantry, the horse soldiers supposedly had to fight dismounted.

Starr's richly detailed history of the Union cavalry must open this orthodoxy to reappraisal. Reflection on the first volume of his trilogy might already have suggested such reappraisal, because in that volume Starr explored in depth the implications for Civil War cavalry of a fact well-known but of neglected importance, that before 1861 there was no strong American cavalry tradition. Mounted troops had fought from time to time — Philadelphians know that the First City Troop served in the Revolution — but the Regular Army had no continuous mounted force until the Regiment of Dragoons in 1833. Then, whether called dragoons or cavalry, this and other regular regiments had tended, like dragoons, to fight dismounted. Accordingly, as Starr's first volume showed, it required half the Civil War to lay the foundation of an effective Union mounted arm. Cavalry inexperience as well as infantry firepower ought to be considered among the causes of the cavalry's difficulties in fighting infantry.

Once capable cavalry chieftains such as Major Generals Philip H. Sheridan and George A. Custer built upon the foundation laid before Gettysburg to create a mature mounted arm, cavalry warfare came to a flowering unprecedented in America and belying the historians' conventional wisdom. In this second volume, Starr scrupulously re-examines, largely from the primary sources, every cavalry action of any consequence in the Eastern Theater from after Gettysburg to Appomattox. The successful mounted assault against infantry proves not absent. Sheridan employed it most spectacularly at the battle of the Opequon in the Shenandoah Valley on September 19, 1864. After Lieutenant General Jubal A. Early's Confederate army had fought Sheridan's infantry to a standstill through most of the day, the cavalry divisions of Custer and William W. Averell, in accordance with Sheridan's plan, struck the Confederate left flank. "Every man of the five [cavalry] brigades was mounted and in his place. . . . It was a scene and an occasion made to order for George Custer's lush eloquence" (p. 274). And Starr quotes Custer at length, expatiating on "one of the most inspiring as well as imposing scenes of martial grandeur ever witnessed upon a battle-field" (p.

275). Not only grand to behold, the cavalry charge was highly effective in its result. It broke the Confederate line, and it led into another spectacle rarely seen in earlier Union victories, a driving, devastating pursuit. A similar classic mounted pursuit climaxed Sheridan's victory at Cedar Creek a month later. A similar mounted charge by Custer's regiments completed Sheridan's victory at Five Forks the next spring, and it was the mobility of the mature Union mounted arm that drove the Confederate army to its death in the eight days following Five Forks.

Starr is fully aware that the Union cavalry continued often to fight dismounted. But he demonstrates that dismounted action was less a matter of choice and doctrine than recent historians have tended to suppose. By returning to the battlefield, moreover, by scrupulously investigating what actually occurred in combat, Starr raises implicitly some serious questions about military history as many current practitioners of the discipline write it. The "new" military history, that version prevailing since about the end of World War II, has emphasized the noncombat aspects of its subject: military institutions, military thought, civil-military relations. The "new" military history has tended deliberately and self-consciously to eschew battle narratives, on the ground that the basic sources of change in military organizations, and thus the aspects of military problems with which concerned civilians ought to be acquainted, are to be found elsewhere, in the deeper social context in which the military exists. (Furthermore, battle narratives seem an old-fashioned kind of history, and to peace-loving people they are presumably distasteful as well.) Yet military forces are created primarily because of their ability to make war, and if military history ignores the fighting, how are we to know what military forces are really like, and why?

It has been a kind of theoretical approach to military history, bypassing real battlefields, that has led military historians to conclude that by the 1860s, mounted cavalry warfare was passé. A theoretical model of a battle fought with the rifled firearms of the mid-nineteenth century seemed to demonstrate that mounted combat was obsolete. Starr, by returning to real battles instead of theoretical models, has not only upset the "new" military history's orthodoxies. He may also have pointed the way toward a better understanding of the nature of nineteenth-century American military institutions — a favorite subject of the "new" military history — than more fashionable historians have themselves achieved. We have never known what to make of the success and acceptance of the George A. Custer type, a throwback to the romantic cavalier, in the supposedly almost modern Civil War army. Starr suggests that it is not the prominence of the cavaliers but our conceptions of how soon military modernity came along that require rethinking.

Temple University

RUSSELL F. WEIGLEY

The Earnest Men: Republicans and the Civil War Senate. By ALLAN G. BOGUE. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981. 369 p. Tables, appendices, index. \$28.50.)

This is as the dust jacket says, a "long awaited book by a distinguished historian" who has been at work on the subject for almost two decades. A number of interesting papers have raised expectations. While Bogue has written an interesting book, against this backdrop, *The Earnest Men* is ultimately disappointing.

Many of the most important modern scholars of Civil War politics have been associated with the University of Wisconsin. Hesselstine, Beale, Williams, Current, and Staïpp, along with others formed a central column in the revisionist edifice that dominated this field until the 1960s. In this book, Bogue, who is the present Frederick Jackson Turner Professor of History at Wisconsin, extends the criticism of these scholars by correcting and building upon their work rather than rejecting it. Unfortunately, on some of the major historiographical questions Bogue refuses to tip his hand.

In the first place, he defines his subject extremely narrowly. Bogue begins by saying that this is "an inquiry into the nature of radicalism in the Civil War Senate." He then goes to lengths to deny that this book was intended to be a history of the Senate during the Civil War. Secondly, while Bogue is clearly conversant with the social science literature on legislative behavior and employs sophisticated quantitative techniques, he has eschewed the "social science framework of hypothesis or model testing." The former is a shame since numerous tantalizing bits of information make the reader wish this were a broader study; the latter, because, in the end, the author's position is not always clear.

The thesis of the book, such as it is, is carried in the title. Senators during the Civil War were "earnest" — the dictionary definition of which is, "an intense and serious state of mind; not flippant." This characteristic seems to be a crucial defining element of Radicalism. Yet, Bogue does not deny that either the Moderates or the Democrats were also "earnest," which weakens his thrust. It is clear whom he likes, but he carefully avoids judgmental statements — except about Charles Sumner. The Massachusetts Radical is portrayed as a bothersome twit, constantly confusing the attempts of the more quiet party managers to organize the behavior of the Senate.

In the first part of the book, he examines living arrangements, rules, committee assignments, and seating patterns in an attempt to fathom the inner workings of the Senate. The most important chapter in this section concentrates on defining radicalism in terms of the response to a number of roll call votes on crucial war issues. In doing so, Bogue brings greater precision to the discussion of blocs within the Republican majority than any

previous historian. The collective biography that follows is less satisfying. Although there is a religious factor at work, Radicals do not differ greatly from their opponents and the Civil War Senators differ little from men who served in the late nineteenth century. This is somewhat, disquieting, because late in the book Bogue bootlegs in a sub-thesis concerning the relationship between radicalism and modernization.

The second, and larger, part of *The Earnest Men* contains a detailed analysis of the legislative history of crucial Civil War issues: taxes, civil rights, and the treatment of the rebels. It is "traditional" history in the extreme. Few scholars have paid such close attention to the debates and to the details of parliamentary process. Minutely dissecting speeches on amendment after amendment, Bogue presents the Civil War Senators' justifications of their behavior. He introduces very little evidence outside the debates themselves. From these he portrays the differences between elements of the Civil War Senate as basically matters of constitutional interpretation although he is willing to equate certain constitutional outlooks with perspectives on questions related to economic development. On the whole, he argues that the Radicals were a nationalizing and, thus, a modernizing force.

Those familiar with Bogue's earlier books will not expect a "good read." The analysis is dense and the prose prolix. There are, however, disquieting aspects to *The Earnest Men*. The most important is Bogue's unwillingness to probe motivation. The earlier "Wisconsin school" undoubtedly exaggerated the degree to which rhetoric represented a smoke screen, obscuring the actor's "real" intent. He seemingly accepts these "earnest men" at face value. He makes little use of the many manuscript collections which he read. What I am trying to say is not that Bogue is a sloppy scholar, rather that his rectitude stands in the way of a full exercise of his abilities. In a book from which any historian can learn something, the author proves himself more "earnest" than his subjects.

Lehigh University

WILLIAM G. SHADE

- Called and Chosen: The Story of Mother Rebecca Jackson and Her Philadelphia Shakers.* By RICHARD E. WILLIAMS. (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1981. xiii, 179 p. Appendices, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$11.00.)
- Gifts of Power: The Writings of Rebecca Jackson, Black Visionary, Shaker Eldress.* Edited by JEAN McMAHON HUMEZ. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981. viii, 368 p. Appendices, illustrations, glossary, bibliography. \$20.00.)

Taken together these two volumes present a sympathetic, perceptive study of Rebecca Cox Jackson (1795–1871), black Shaker eldress, and the Shaker out-community she founded in Philadelphia (1854–1908). Although both works are based on the autobiographical writings of Jackson, their perspectives are quite different. Williams is more concerned with the institutional aspects of the Philadelphia out-community, and employs documents from the Mt. Lebanon and Watervliet, N.Y. Shaker communities to trace its history down to its demise in 1908. His focus provides a wide-angle perspective on Rebecca Jackson and the meaning of her spiritual experience in the context of the predominantly white Protestant religious infrastructure of mid-nineteenth-century America. Humez, whose volume embodies a critical, meticulous editing of the very disparate body of Jackson's autobiographical writings, is more concerned with the intensely personal dimension of her experience. Humez puts Jackson in the context of emotional feminine religion as it was practiced in the black churches — more particularly in the praying bands and holiness tradition of the A.M.E. Church. Williams is somewhat less precise on Jackson's early religious background and mistakenly situates her conversion experience in a Presbyterian setting (p. 19).

The most arresting aspects of Jackson's religious career, as it is set forth in these two works, revolve around her role as a black female prophet. *Gifts of Power* provides a sensitive feminist reading of her religious experience. As Humez demonstrates, the radical conversion experience of Jackson (1830), that resulted in celibacy, is at once a source of isolation and power. She insisted on her right to continue to live with her husband despite her refusal to continue conjugal relations, which radically altered the nature of their marriage. Her commitment to celibacy apparently alienated her family, friends, and former religious associates. It also led her to form closer female friendships, like the one with Rebecca Perot, who would direct the Philadelphia out-community from Jackson's death until 1896. Yet, celibacy assured Jackson complete control over her own body; an essential personal autonomy. It was celibacy, too, that led to a wider religious influence for Jackson through her association with the Shakers.

As a free black woman in the North, Jackson faced a Protestant religious establishment that strongly favored ecclesiastical segregation. Her own early

religious affiliation was with the A.M.E. Bethel Church in Philadelphia, a black Methodist congregation. Even in Shaker communities, the practice of integration was not as consistent as might be expected. Williams provides more perspective on the variety of Shaker responses to the issue of race than Humez, pointing out that the South Union, Kentucky Community incorporated a *separate* Black Family and that some unspecified black towns were situated on Shaker property. More positive evidence is suggested by Williams but remains undocumented in the text. Indeed, the Shaker relationship to the predominantly black out-community established by Rebecca Jackson seems to have followed a policy of black separation not unlike that of the eighteenth-century Quakers. Surprisingly, both Humez and Williams view the Shakers as apparently more consistently liberal on racial issues than their record seems to justify.

Jackson's enduring commitment to bringing Shakerism to her people may in part have grown out of her perception of the limited capacity of white Shakers to accept the notion of fully integrated communities. A passing reference to the "little family in Philadelphia of darkies" (Williams, p. 112) in the "Mt. Lebanon Records" (June 24, 1873) suggests that Shakers may have shared the racial stereotypes of the day. From this point of view, one of the more poignant ironies in Jackson's journal is the reflection of certain emotive, disapprobative connotations associated with color in her comment that her sins were "black as blackness" (Humez, p. 168).

Given the current historiographical trend toward recording the historical experience of forgotten Americans, a better subject than Rebecca Jackson could not have been found. Not only was she a member of a small body of millenarian sectarians who espoused a highly unpopular celibate theology, but she was female, black, and labored in the urban garment industry. Even by the standards of nineteenth-century evangelical religiosity, Rebecca Jackson's spiritual experience was especially intense, the texture of her personal sacred world particularly rich. She was a self-proclaimed theodidact, who derived her pentecostal power from mystical revelations, faith healing, and, she suggests, animal magnetism or mesmerism. And yet, the overall impression the autobiography leaves on the reader is not that of the cloistered saint, but that of a black, charismatic woman who insists on immersion in everyday life. Her struggles to overcome the frailties of her physical constitution (epileptoid convulsions and perhaps coronary disease), and the infirmity of her will as a means to attain perfection are eloquent testimony of her fundamental humanness. Despite the passage of a century and the secularism of our age, her spiritual experience is not alien to us. In her travail we recognize something akin to our own.

The Urban Establishment: Upper Strata in Boston, New York, Charleston, Chicago, and Los Angeles. By FREDERIC COPLE JAHER. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982. xi, 777 p. Index. Cloth \$35.00, paper \$17.50.)

There has been increasing interest recently in the history of the "upper class" in the United States by such scholars as E. Digby Baltzell, John Ingham, Edward Pessen, and Ronald Story. In *The Urban Establishment*, Frederic Cople Jaher presents the most comprehensive, thoroughly researched, and, in many respects, the most thoughtful treatment yet of this subject. Jaher examines closely the "upper strata" in Boston, New York, Charleston, Chicago, and Los Angeles, concentrating on the nineteenth century, especially for the first three cities, but ranging from the colonial period to the present. He focuses on three interrelated aspects of these groups: composition, operation, and ideology.

Jaher outlines a model of the development of upper strata. Beginning as "commercial elites," these groups become "upper classes" by gradually achieving "hegemony" over social, cultural, and political affairs. But this expansion leads them to fragment into subgroups, turn their attention from the economic activity that provided their initial success, and ultimately be swept away by *arrivistes*. Boston Brahmins, according to Jaher, adhere most closely to this model. About forty interrelated families, with prominence derived originally from commerce, successfully strengthened their position between 1820 and 1860 by controlling early industrialization. During these years, Brahmins founded banks that controlled capital in New England, dominated the Massachusetts Whig party, and supported a broad range of cultural and philanthropic activities which "functioned expressively and instrumentally to perpetuate patrician hegemony" (p. 57). With the decline of the New England textile industry after 1870, Brahmins lost power as they increasingly deserted entrepreneurial activity and the political roles that sustained it, while concentrating on charitable and cultural affairs and refusing to absorb newly successful men.

In none of the other cities, Jaher believes, did the upper strata fully coalesce into an upper class. In New York, for instance, Knickerbocker families comparable to Brahmins were already in decline by the 1850s, shunning investments in manufacturing, losing their preeminence in banking, and seeing themselves displaced by immigrant merchants. An impressive prosopographic analysis of wealthy New Yorkers in 1856-57 refutes Pessen's assertion that few self-made men were rich, and shows that they had fewer kin connections among themselves and with the wealthy group of 1828 than did their Brahmin counterparts. In Charleston, following still another pattern, the decline of the "Old Guard" was not gradual, but the result of

the "abrupt disaster" of the Civil War (p. 399) which decimated its members, destroyed its property, and ushered in new economic enterprises in which it did not participate. (This claim is not buttressed by the extensive data presented for northern cities, hence it is unclear if it refutes contrary findings for elsewhere in the South recently reported by Jonathan Weiner and others.) Upperclass Chicago and "Old Guard" Los Angeles were even less firmly established and declined more quickly than their eastern counterparts.

The remarkable depth of research in both original and secondary sources and the strength which comes from a broader comparative framework than that of previous elite studies lends credibility to Jaher's conclusions. He relates his findings to "the controversy over the power structure of contemporary America" (p. 2) and concludes that they do not clearly support the existence of a "power elite." "If there is such a group . . . it has shifting geographical bases, high turnover in personnel, and great responsiveness to social and economic change" (p. 730).

But some scholars may have reservations about Jaher's work. In such a massive study they will inevitably find a few errors; Harvard alumni, for instance, will be surprised to see Hasty Pudding referred to as a "final club" (p. 110). Perhaps more seriously, methodologists will be disappointed to find subjective criteria used to identify elite groups whose memberships are never enumerated. It is not surprising, for instance, that Jaher therefore discovers "multifunctional" "aristocracies"; their memberships, after all, were originally selected precisely because they reportedly had "influence," "control," and "leadership." The relative size of the elite groups Jaher discusses, furthermore, is different for each city, making comparisons — in regards to social mobility, for example — problematic.

Where do the upper strata in Philadelphia belong in this analysis? Jaher believes they most closely resemble Boston's pattern. But if Baltzell is correct in *Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia*, elite Philadelphians never coalesced into an aristocracy as Brahmins did. Support for this viewpoint actually may be found in Jaher's findings for other cities and his emphasis on the distinctions among his elite groups. The bustling dynamic urban atmosphere which undermined the nineteenth-century New York upper class already existed in eighteenth-century Philadelphia and may have prevented a true upper class from ever forming. Philadelphia also lacked a manorial tradition and religious homogeneity among the elite, which assisted aristocratic development after the Revolution in New York and Boston, respectively. Indeed, the separate world of Quakers in early Philadelphia resembles the situation of Jews in Los Angeles after 1900: the decline of "Old Guard" Angelenos was hastened by the exclusion of the numerous wealthy Jews in the city from social and political prominence.

Jaher's rich and provocative book will be the basis for a long time for similar re-examinations of upper strata in all American cities.

University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire

ROBERT GOUGH

Life, Work, and Rebellion in the Coal Fields: Southern West Virginia Coal Miners, 1880 - 1922. By DAVID A. CORBIN. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981. xix, 294 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. Cloth \$24.95; paper \$12.50.)

A "new" labor historian, David A. Corbin attempts to place the violent history of the West Virginia miners in its socio-cultural context. He dismisses a prevailing interpretation of that violence as sporadic outbursts of primitives who extended the tradition of family feuding to labor relations as "erroneous, pejorative reasoning." Rather he argues that it was the "mature response of fully sane and industrialized workers" which illustrates class consciousness. Thus Corbin disagrees with the interpretations of American social structure presented by both the consensus historians and the Wisconsin school of labor historians.

The company town and guard system were the anvil and hammer which forged class consciousness among southern West Virginia miners. The company town precluded the development of a caste system for most were racially integrated while standardized housing promoted a sense of social equality. Company control of churches, schools, and politics rendered middle class leadership suspect forcing the miners to look among themselves for leaders and institutions to reflect their interests. The brutality of Baldwin-Felts guards underscored economic injustices thereby dramatizing the need for collective response among the miners.

Corbin is careful to place the repressive actions of the mine operators in a context larger than greed. West Virginia operators had convinced themselves that they were targeted for destruction by a conspiracy between the United Mine Workers of America and their fellow capitalists in the Central Competitive Field. They were equally convinced that the UMW had been captured by socialists who would use the union to destroy the free enterprise system. Gripped by "panic-fear," they fought the union as a matter of self-preservation while believing they were protecting America from radicalism.

Ironically, the radicalism of the miners was couched in Americanism not Marxism. The miners sought the basic American rights of dignity and liberty from the brutal despotism of the West Virginia coal establishment. Denied due process of law by the company guard system, their only recourse was

violence. Indeed, a romantic might project Corbin's argument into a second War for Independence waged, this time, against the tyranny of internal colonialism.

Corbin skillfully utilizes the concepts of internal colonization, work, and culture in interpreting his data. He also addresses the roles played by race, family, religion, and mobility in forming the miners' self-awareness. In short, this study provides an excellent example of the "new" labor history.

Yet Corbin fails to prove his contention that the West Virginia miners were class conscious. True, they reacted collectively, but it was group not class oriented action. Their failure to adopt the rhetoric and slogans of Marxism betrays their failure to achieve class consciousness.

Corbin's explanation of the miners' failure to adopt Marxism — they were uninformed by its intellectual traditions — is weak. Rhetoric and slogans do not require theoretical understanding for acceptance; they appeal to values and emotions which are the very basis of consciousness. To say that the socialist vocabulary carried no appeal among the miners is to argue that the images the words evoked were foreign to their *Weltanschauung*.

Americanism, however, fired their imaginations. Americanism exalts the individual. But in practice it recognizes the voluntary association as a proper instrument for promoting the individual's welfare. In referring to Americanism as the model and justification for their actions, the West Virginia miners dramatized that they considered themselves an interest group not part of a class.

In part Corbin's argument suffers from his failure to define precisely class. He quotes E. P. Thompson that class occurs "when some men, as a result of common experience (inherited or shared) feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves, and against other men whose interests are different from and usually opposed to theirs" as his working model. But any interest group falls within that definition!

All of this is not to detract from the value of this book. It is an excellent case study of the southern West Virginia miners. Rather it is intended to outline the study's limitations. Class consciousness cannot be demonstrated by examining a single occupational group narrowly confined on a geographical basis. Corbin asks too much from his data. Moreover, in his anxiety to illustrate class consciousness, Corbin overlooks potentially embarrassing implications of his evidence. To explain the failure to adopt Marxism as a function of the miners' ignorance seems to be erroneous and pejorative reasoning.

*The Pennsylvania State University,
Hazleton Campus*

HAROLD W. AURAND

Engineering Education at Penn State: A Century in the Land-Grant Tradition.

By MICHAEL BEZILLA. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1981. viii, 239 p. Illustrations, appendices, index. \$16.95.)

Professor Bezilla might have taken a cue from Broadway and called his work "How to Succeed in Engineering Education Without Really Trying." He tells the story of a mediocre school, with poor facilities and ill-trained professors, that somehow produced a surprisingly large number of capable engineers. While Bezilla does not dwell on this paradox or Penn State's shortcomings, he does not obscure them either. Unlike many authors of university histories with an eye to the administration and alumni, he is candid and realistic. His work, succinct, informative and analytical, is a welcome addition to the literature of technical education in the United States and to the history of public services in Pennsylvania.

Penn State's engineering college seems to have had more than its share of difficulties. The most obvious and persistent of these was a parsimonious legislature which forced the school to lead a hand-to-mouth existence from its founding in the 1850s to the present, except for one brief affluent interlude in the 1950s and 1960s. Institutional poverty in turn created or exacerbated other problems — an overworked faculty, a disgracefully modest commitment to research, an unimaginative curriculum, a paucity of graduate offerings, and a substandard physical plant. Since these flaws were impossible to conceal it is hard to understand why the engineering college's administrators did not try to correct them. But apart from perfunctory cries of anguish when the legislature turned down their requests, they did little. Indeed, by keeping tuition so low that the school was always swamped with students and continually expanding extension activities, they made the situation worse. To all the other problems, then, must be added one that Bezilla only indirectly notes, a remarkably short-sighted group of college and university administrators. Still, the Penn State program apparently worked. The schools' engineers generally had no trouble finding jobs and, insofar as Bezilla can determine, performed well in competition with graduates from other schools. Does this mean that bare bare bones education is enough? Or that engineering education generally is poor? Bezilla does not speculate about the implications of his story or compare Penn State's situation with that of other institutions in Pennsylvania or elsewhere.

More important, Bezilla neglects the experiences of professors and students in classrooms and laboratories, the critical but hard-to-document feature of the Penn State story that might have explained why a mediocre school produced capable engineers. The reader learns more about deans and administrators, who are best forgotten, and plans for buildings and programs,

which seldom materialized, then about the activities that enabled Penn State graduates to function successfully as technicians and managers. By slighting the grass roots educational process Bezilla implies that what was learned was neither interesting nor noteworthy. Perhaps he is right. In any event, the mystery of Penn State's success remains. With this exception Bezilla's account is a model of detailed, analytical history that should serve as a stimulus for other students of technical education.

The University of Akron

DANIEL NELSON

Hearth & Home: Preserving a People's Culture. By GEORGE W. McDANIEL. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982. xxiv, 297 p. Illustrations, appendices, bibliography, index. \$25.00.)

When I first noticed an advertisement for this book, its title intrigued me. It did not, however, give more than a tantalizing hint of the book's subject matter. Now that I have read *Hearth & Home* with considerable pleasure and interest, I can gladly report that it is, in fact, a highly unusual book. It fits tidily into no familiar category. Nevertheless it has at least three spiritual "god-parents." First, Henry Glassie's *Pattern in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States* (1968), because McDaniel is deeply interested in the varied uses of vernacular architecture by humble people: slaves, sharecroppers, and tenant farmers. Second, Theodore Rosengarten's *All God's Dangers: The Life of Nate Shaw* (1974), because McDaniel is extremely successful in using oral history interviews to reconstruct modes of living that are poorly recorded in conventional historical sources. Third, Peter Wood's *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina* (1974), because McDaniel is especially engaged by the question of which Africanisms survived, which did not, and which were blended with British modes of existence to form the material culture of Afro-Americans in Maryland, especially along the western side of Chesapeake Bay.

Hearth & Home also informs us about continuities and changes in the daily lives of black people as they made the profound shift from slavery to freedom. For that reason this book belongs on the same shelf with Herbert Gutman's *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom* (1976) and Leon Litwack's richly detailed *The Aftermath of Slavery* (1979). Although McDaniel has written an unusually personal monograph, it is heavily dependent, nonetheless, on meticulous and insightful fieldwork. His 116 illustrations are fascinating, and very much an integral part of the "story." We owe McDaniel especial thanks for the timeliness of his work, because many of his "inform-

ants" were quite elderly when he interviewed them and subsequently have died. Their "testimony" is an essential and unique aspect of McDaniel's presentation as well as documentation. The historical potential of some topics may ripen with time; but not this one. McDaniel moved just a step ahead of bulldozers, termites, and the physical demise of his informants — humans and houses alike. Ultimately, what he has compiled is the nitty-gritty saga of a house-type. Although his geographical focus is a six-county area of Maryland (due south and slightly west of Baltimore), he has made a broadly significant contribution to architectural, agricultural, and social history, not to mention black, local, and oral history. This is also a work of prime importance for preservationists and for designers of museum exhibits. It is a major step forward in the democratization of historical methods, knowledge, and understanding.

A brief review can only supply a sampling of what the reader will learn: for example, that the "turnover" rate in the occupancy of tenant homes could be very high (though not always); that whites and blacks often lived in the same structure (though sequentially rather than simultaneously); and that a "dirt floor" did not mean what we commonly envision, especially on the basis of inauthentic museum and "living farm" exhibits. Earthen floors were often remembered as being "like cement," and could be kept very clean. In addition, McDaniel located 53 work contracts from the Freedmen's Bureau and is able to fill in our knowledge of the conditions under which 102 former slaves contracted for work. And he uses several case studies of homes *owned* by blacks as an effective way to assess social change in these rural areas.

Occasional flaws occur, but they are mostly minor. McDaniel is wrong about the inadequacy of thatched roofs and why they have disappeared (pp. 89–90). In June 1981 I observed and slept under superb thatched roofs (called *chaumière*) in lower Brittany (at Grande Brière and near Kernascléden). I do not understand how McDaniel can claim that "the stone slave house at Basil Smith's farm in Anne Arundel County is perhaps the only surviving example in southern Maryland, and is probably typical" (p. 92). How on earth can one ascertain whether the only surviving example is "typical"? McDaniel does not need to make such absurd claims. The evidence that he has ingeniously found is remarkable, and we are grateful for it, typical or no. Finally, McDaniel observes of house slaves (as distinct from field hands who lived in separate structures) that they "had to submit to living almost continually in the environment of whites and under their surveillance" (p. 97). Was the reverse not also true? Where Afro-Americans lived in the "main house" rather than in a "dependency," the whites were equally under surveillance by the blacks. The result was an extremely ambiguous intimacy that was well described by such travellers as Frederick Law Olmsted.

These are small cavils considering McDaniel's overall achievement. He

has written a pioneering study that will be valued by scholars in many different fields. One measure of its success is that, simultaneously, it could be used quite effectively in undergraduate courses, but should also serve as a model for future researchers interested in the history of humble homes and ordinary folk in other regions of the United States.

Cornell University

MICHAEL KAMMEN

The Workers' World at Hagley. By GLENN PORTER. (Wilmington, Delaware: Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation, 1981. 66 p. Photographs. \$4.95.)

In 1802 Eleuthère Irénée du Pont established a powder works along the banks of the Brandywine Creek several miles north and west of Wilmington, Delaware. Surrounding the powder mills and the home of E.I. du Pont (and later the homes of his heirs) grew an industrial village which was the place of work and residence for four generations of workers before this original facility of what came to be E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company was closed in 1921. *The Workers' World at Hagley* is a handsome collection of sixty-odd photographs, largely taken during the period 1880–1910, which depicts the working, family and associational lives of the laboring people of the Brandywine community.

The volume was published in conjunction with the opening on Labor Day, September 7, 1981, of an exhibit at the Hagley Museum which overlooks the Brandywine Creek and is the centerpiece of a restoration of the Dupont-established powder works and settlement. The exhibit, entitled "The Workers' World: The Industrial Village and the Company Town," will eventually travel to museums in Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., Dearborn, Michigan and Chicago. In many ways, the collection of photographs issued to commemorate the exhibition is more evocative and successful than the larger traveling display.

The exhibit fills one and a half rooms and is primarily comprised of enlarged black and white photographs and scholarly annotations. The display clearly reflects the influence of the "new" social history: work, working conditions, strikes, labor politics and trade unionism take a back seat to family, community, recreational and religious experience. Despite an attempt at a more comprehensive, human and immediate history, the exhibit suffers from a lack of life and lustre: the photographs and materials shown come from scattered locations and evoke no single moment, period, place or circumstance; the lighting and aura are dim and soft and the sounds, heat, smells and color of working life are hardly rendered; there is little to touch

or be touched by and little beckoning the spectator to linger and absorb (this reviewer noticed that most visitors proceeded through the exhibition in less than fifteen minutes). Finally, the exhibitors provide no justification for striking the industrial village/company town dichotomy or for excluding other settings for industrialization.

The photographs and the printed matter in the volume released for the exhibit, on the other hand, have definite interest, meaning and impact. First, the photographs are from one place and time. The rural, isolated, enclosed and communal character of the Brandywine settlement is clearly imparted; how this seemingly pristine community was periodically punctuated by accidental explosions and tragedy is also revealed. Particularly effective are the quotations from former inhabitants of the village, who were interviewed in the 1950s, which appear below the stills. Their words are more than informative; they provide an understanding of how the workers of the Brandywine industrial village understood their own world, both its joys and hardships. (The quotations are more insightful than the scholarly captions gracing the photographs in the exhibit; since the quotations are so effective, it is unfortunate that the editor of the volume chose to list the names and personal and occupational histories of the workers cited at the end of the book rather than under each quotation.) Finally, the photographs are extremely forceful in depicting the inescapable and looming presence of the Du Ponts; their eyes and hands appear to have seen and touched everything and everyone in the community.

The only weak link in the printed collection is the introduction. Written more for the exhibit than the photographs at hand, the scant perspective offered on the Brandywine community is unsatisfying. The greatest disappointment comes in the final paragraphs when the reader is briefly informed that most of the photographs were taken by a French immigrant worker, Pierre Gentieu, who rose to a modest managerial post in the powder yards. This is his volume and his life should have been a larger subject of the introduction.

University of Pennsylvania

WALTER LICHT

American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States. By JAMES HENNESEY. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981. xvi, 397 p. Index. \$19.95.)

James Hennesey's survey of American Catholic history is an impressive achievement. The author has consulted virtually every relevant source, from the Vatican Archives, to specialized articles in church journals such as the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, to the latest monographs in "mainstream" U.S. history. The result is a comprehensive synthesis which portrays American Catholicism as thoroughly as Sydney Ahlstrom's, *A Religious History of the American People* (1972), did American Protestantism.

Bowing to the current interest in "history from the bottom up," Hennesey promises a "people history" which "while not neglecting the story of bishops and clergy, of structures and institutions, . . . must be more concerned with the people who *were* the community." His book delivers on this promise admirably, providing a rich, diverse, pluralistic portrait of American Catholics. He begins with the Spanish settlers of the Southwest, the French of Louisiana and New France, and the English Catholics of Maryland, then goes on to discuss the waves of Catholic immigrants from Ireland, Germany, Poland, and so many other European countries. Yet he also features lesser known groups such as the Catholic Abenaki and Potawatomi Indians, black Catholic slaves, and recent Hispanic migrants. Religious orders of women and laypeople of both sexes loom nearly as large in his account as bishops and priests. Hennesey also surveys the growth and development of Catholicism in the South and Far West, as well as in the heavily Catholic cities of the Northeast and Midwest. In sum, this book contains such a breadth of material on American Catholic life that anyone who grew up Catholic, or has ever had contact with Catholics, anywhere in the United States, will find numerous echoes of his own experience.

Both rural and urban Pennsylvania are well represented in this kaleidoscopic history. English Catholics from Lord Baltimore's Maryland crossed the Mason-Dixon line into the fertile farmlands of southeastern Pennsylvania during the eighteenth century, and they were soon joined as settlers by numerous German Catholics. The first urban Catholic parish in the thirteen colonies was founded in Philadelphia in 1734, and by the time of the Revolution Philadelphia had become the "premier Catholic center" of the new nation. The city later lost this preeminence to Baltimore, New York, Chicago, and other cities, but a vigorous Catholic presence remained. Hennesey emphasizes the importance of Denis Cardinal Dougherty in twentieth-century Philadelphia life. Proclaiming himself "God's bricklayer," Dougherty presided over rapid institutional growth of the Philadelphia archdiocese, particularly its parochial school system, during his thirty-three year tenure

(1918–1951). He was most famous (or infamous) for his support of the Legion of Decency and his 1934 appeal to all Philadelphia Catholics for a total boycott of motion pictures.

The very comprehensiveness of *American Catholics*, however, is responsible for some of the book's flaws. Hennesey packs so much information into pages that he frequently must resort to mere listing of names, places, and events; and he often jumps somewhat awkwardly from topic to topic. The three paragraphs on page 314, for example, list the major bishops appointed in the 1970s, provide a roster of prominent Catholics in politics, and discuss the shock many Catholics felt when the Pope permitted them to eat meat on Fridays in 1966 — all this with little transition between topics. The chapter headings make this problem worse. Usually drawn from standard eras in American history, such as the Civil War, Reconstruction, the Gilded Age, the headings give little indication of the subjects treated in each chapter. Basically, Hennesey has followed a strictly chronological arrangement of chapters and has discussed whatever Catholic events occurred in each period, with minimal attention to logical coherence.

Hennesey breaks no new interpretive ground, though he admirably summarizes the latest interpretation of each event he chronicles. His judgments are balanced, sensible, and ecumenical; but like his factual narrations, they are too often fragmented. Frequently, he raises a fascinating interpretive point at the beginning of a chapter, a point which could give coherence to a whole era of Catholic history, but then drops it too soon.

Nonetheless, *American Catholics* is a fine historical survey, an essential reference work for specialists and non-specialists, Catholics and non-Catholics. There is still room for a better-structured, more interpretive study; but until one appears, this is the best survey of American Catholicism to date.

Carleton University

EDWARD R. KANTOWICZ

American Political History as Social Analysis. By SAMUEL P. HAYS. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1980. 459 p. Index. \$25.00.)

A year after I started teaching at Carnegie Tech, Sam Hays moved next door as chairman at Pitt. The first time I spoke in public about the communications argument in *Boss Tweed's New York* was at a seminar he arranged at The Cathedral. Although long gone from Pittsburgh, I count myself as one of the legion who have been touched by his passion for the historian's craft, his faith in the importance of ideas, and his integrity.

Sam Hays has always been a generous speaker and an indefatigable essayist. Though I thought I knew the corpus of his work, this collection adds several new friends to old. Even the familiar pieces — “Politics of Reform” and “New Possibilities” — bear re-reading and benefit from convenient juxtaposition under the mantle of a revealing personal introduction. Read together and in sequence, the essays fill me with fond memories of his excitement the first time we met as he showed me how he was using a manuscript census volume; of admiration for the loyalty which projects even his masters students into the center of the historiographic world.

The collection also makes sense of old differences of opinion which I had never stopped to understand though they now seem quite obvious. I am principally interested in using historical analysis to inform my political values and actions. So long — and insofar — as voting matters in politics, I am interested in the ethnocultural bases of electoral choice.

Not so for Sam Hays. His dominant concern is with the patterned relationships called “culture” and “social structure” and with the ways individuals and groups make sense of their worlds. Political behavior is a revealing measure of relationships and perceptions because it is pervasive, repeated and amenable to diachronic analysis. Politics — like religion and art — is a public mode of imposing order on a surrounding chaos. The argument is in the title he has chosen for this collection. He is not so much concerned with the social bases of politics as with political history “as social analysis.”

Sam Hays is a moralist who — in his own mind — has refused to use historical analysis for policy guidance. Normative thinking, he said in 1964, had “restricted the imagination” of political historians. In a revealing passage in the Introduction to this volume he insists:

I have not sought out the past to decide what values, personal or political, to support in the present or to reinforce these values, and I have never considered the historical inquiries in which I engaged to be directly relevant to those choices. My decision to be a conscientious objector in World War II came not out of reading history but out of personal, existential choice. And so have other political involvements. Hence I have been rather indifferent to the direct role which my historical writing plays in current political issues.

That passage is like the best of the ethnocultural descriptions Sam Hays has encouraged. The unaffected statement of conscientious objection and of indifference reveals the “otherness” of a familiar figure, commanding respect even as it provokes profound disagreement.

University of Pennsylvania

SEYMOUR J. MANDELBAUM