

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley.*  
By BARRY LEVY. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988. 340p.  
Appendix, index. \$24.95.)

At a time when politicians of all stripes are trumpeting the necessity of returning to traditional “family values,” Barry Levy has written what this reviewer hoped would be a major contribution to the debate over what those values were and how they developed in America. Indeed, Levy postulates that historians for too long have overstated the role played by New England and the impact of industrialization on the origin of the ideology of “domesticity”—that is, “morally self-sufficient households” where women “cultivated motherhood to nurture conscience in America’s children.” To Levy, the significant part played by northwestern British Quakers in Pennsylvania in establishing that ideology has been overlooked, a failing he believes is rectified with this book.

Briefly, Levy argues that the Quakers of North Wales and Cheshire, England, were in general poor and powerless “middling” people—yeomen, husbandmen, and artisans—who realized that the ultimate survival of their religion was predicated on keeping their children within the sect. To attain that goal, they needed both to establish autonomous spiritual-based family units to protect their children from the world and to accumulate sufficient landed wealth for conveyance to their sons, who would then be well positioned in what Levy calls the “Quaker marriage market.” Spiritual discipline within the home was strengthened when the Quakers empowered women, through the institution of monthly meetings, to wield equivalent spiritual authority with men. Consequently, Levy claims, these Welsh and Cheshire Quaker households became filled with “holy conversation”—behavior conducive to Quaker professions of honesty and fair dealing; such conduct reflected the individual’s inner being. Quaker parents were not to use passionate language or to hit children as a result of “primitive” rage. Good Quaker parents were tender, objective, self-controlled, and insightful. But lacking land and living in areas of relative poverty, these Quaker families were unlikely to see their children remain within the fold.

To Levy, the savior of these northwestern Quakers was William Penn, who founded Pennsylvania in part to alleviate the northwestern British concern over the crisis of Quaker familialism. The northwestern Quakers poured into Pennsylvania, where they became disproportionately influential, and where they obtained sufficient landed and monetary wealth, thanks to mixed-wheat farming, to maintain households of “holy conversation,” which

translated into well-disciplined children uncorrupted by the world and anxious to remain within the sect. Many Quaker women fulfilled their role of holy, nurturing mothers, ministers, and wives. Not everyone did well, of course. Thus poor Quakers were unable to save their children, for they could not compete in the Quaker marriage market.

While in Pennsylvania, Levy insists, these politically dominant northwestern Quakers fended off challenges to their radical form of childrearing from the Quaker separatist, George Keith, and his followers, and from the Anglicans, who established two organizations with the avowed purpose of extirpating Quakerism in the colonies. Ultimately, succeeding generations of Pennsylvania Quakers at all levels experienced greater difficulty in saving their children, although once again the wealthy fared better than their poorer brethren. In any event, Levy concludes, these northwestern Quakers were the prototype for the nineteenth-century New England ideal of domesticity.

In effect, Levy has attempted to prove two distinct hypotheses: first, that the transplanted northwestern British Quakers developed loving, morally distinct households headed by warm, tender, spiritual mothers; and second, that these same Quakers, motivated by their overriding familial concerns, dominated colonial Pennsylvania. In order to prove the first hypothesis, Levy has engaged in substantial Quaker family reconstitution for Chester and the Welsh Tract over several generations while also tracing those families back to their North Welsh and Cheshire environments. This reconstitution has involved the use of such diverse sources as tax lists, wills, probate inventories, and Quaker minutes. Levy's strategy of focusing on the northwest Quaker community on both sides of the Atlantic is original and extremely valuable. The resulting statistics do seem to indicate a greater concern in Pennsylvania by Quakers than by Anglicans for their children's economic and spiritual well-being, a concern which led the Quakers, according to Levy, to minimize the rights of widows to interfere in any way with their offspring's legacies. The statistics also indicate a direct correlation between Quaker wealth and retention of children within the sect.

These two findings, while important, do not in themselves prove Levy's central thesis that northwestern Quaker households were "morally self-sufficient" households of "holy conversation" or that northwestern Quaker women cultivated "motherhood to nurture conscience" in their children. Therefore, Levy looks to alternative sources to demonstrate his point. It is at this juncture that his book raises deeply disturbing questions about balance and accuracy. This reviewer believes that Levy overstates dramatically the significance of childrearing concerns and "holy conversation" in the motives of Quakers individually or corporately. Simply repeating the term "holy conversation" 63 times in 267 pages does not prove that this was the central tenet of Quakerism, or that it was the sole or even prime motivational factor

behind Welsh and Cheshire Quaker immigration, Quaker entrepreneurship, Quaker separatist movements, Quaker opposition to slavery, the origins of the Keithian schism, or the Anglican opposition to the sect. Levy tends to overlook the cultural, linguistic, and nationalistic differences between the Welsh and English. Preservation of the Welsh language and heritage through inclusion in a separate Welsh Tract was particularly important to those who immigrated, many of whom chose not to use or learn English, a fact acknowledged by the Anglican missionary, the Reverend Evan Evans, in 1707, when he begged his superiors to send a Welsh-speaking minister to reconvert to Anglicanism former members of the church who had converted to Quakerism for lack of such a minister. Similarly, Levy's contention that in Pennsylvania the Welsh from North Wales and the English from Cheshire were monolithic in attitude and behavior is debatable at best. In any event, while Levy's map on page 24 of "Rural First Purchasers" implies that those from Cheshire and North Wales were significantly high in number, it should be remembered that many First Purchasers never came to America, and that Levy has eliminated 154 "urban" purchasers from the original map in *The Papers of William Penn*, 2:630. It is true that if each First Purchaser listed by Levy did come to America, those from all of Wales (not just North Wales) and from Cheshire would represent 30.9 percent of the total. However, J. Gwynn Williams in his excellent study on the Welsh of Merioneth (1978-79) estimates that at least half of the Welsh immigrants before 1700 were non-Quaker, and Richard Vann has recently argued that "only a minority of the first settlers of Pennsylvania were British Quakers in good standing" and that the amount of land purchased by all English and Welsh Quaker First Purchasers was less than 40 percent. It would appear therefore that Levy may have greatly overestimated the Welsh and Cheshire Quaker status and impact in the colony, at least in the period prior to 1700.

This penchant for overstatement can also be seen, for example, in Levy's treatment of the Keithian schism, the murder of Jonathan Hayes, and the "feminine mystique" developed by female Quaker ministers. Without going into detail, this reviewer would argue strongly that Levy has misunderstood the evidence he has used when he views the Keithian dispute as between Thomas Lloyd and the northwestern British and Welsh "magistrate-ministers" on one side and George Keith on the other, and when he sees radical childrearing and "holy conversation" as central to the schism. He would do well to rethink his position, particularly on the role played by Lloyd and the "magistrate-ministers." He is also on shaky ground when he insists that Keith brought "large numbers of former Keithians into the Anglican Church." Statistics on the Keithians are scarce, but a contemporary estimate found by J. William Frost claims that about thirty-seven former members

of Philadelphia, Abington, and Oxford Monthly Meetings joined the "English Church." Similarly, Levy's treatment of the murder of Jonathan Hayes, of Chester County, is seriously flawed, containing several important factual errors, as well as misleading conclusions.

Where he misreads his sources in the above examples, Levy unwisely accepts at face value Quaker memorial literature—idealized sketches of departed Friends, often formulaic—for his claim that female Quaker ministers developed a "feminine mystique" which was a prototype for New England. While his use of such sources is admirable, Levy's reliance on these memorials is unwise, since they are virtually the same for Quaker women and men, both in England and America, and at all periods.

It can be justifiably argued that these criticisms are the normal give and take between historians over interpretation. With that in mind, this reviewer postulates an alternative interpretation, believing that early Quakerism suffered from the malaise that affects many "enthusiastic" non-doctrinal radical religious sects—how to pass on to children an emotional experience—the sudden insights early converts often underwent after years of searching for the "truth." The position of Friends was made more difficult by the breadth of their religious testimonies which, after the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy from political power, solidified their exclusion, social respectability, and religious toleration. Persecution and martyrdom helped to attract converts in the short run, but as evangelical fervor receded and religious toleration became a possibility, the Quakers faced potential decline. Quakers who became wealthy or were children of the wealthy often chose, as the eighteenth century progressed, to marry into the Anglican church. William Penn, probably the wealthiest and socially best-connected Quaker, recognized quite early that for many Quakers the answer to their spiritual crisis was a colony that permitted them to obtain for themselves political power, social respectability, and full religious freedom. Pennsylvania was that solution. Ironically, spiritual laxity could result, a point stressed by George Keith, for the children of wealthy, powerful Quakers would be able and willing to remain within the sect even if spiritually weak. It would be unwise for young, ambitious Quakers to intermarry with Anglicans who were virtually excluded in the early years from power. This was equally true, however, of all Quakers in Pennsylvania, not just those from North Wales and Cheshire. As Jack Marietta has indicated in his book, *The Reformation of American Quakerism* (1984), the Quakers did not begin to fully enforce their moral code on rich and poor alike until the mid-eighteenth century with a consequent decline in direct Quaker political participation.

Although this reviewer believes that Levy has attempted a bold, original interpretation, based on years of toil among often recalcitrant sources, it must be said that his book is depressingly sloppy and careless in execution.

While the ultimate blame lies with the author, Oxford University Press is not without culpability, for the book does not appear to have been copy-edited at all. There are numerous typographical, spelling, and factual errors throughout the text, while the footnotes are replete with errors and are consistent only in their extraordinary inconsistency. Such a substantial number of errors gives cause for alarm over Levy's commitment to accuracy.

This concern is heightened when looking at the author's use of quotations. Levy does not tell his readers what his policy is when quoting, but it appears that he has attempted to modernize spelling, capitalization, punctuation, grammar, and syntax, thereby adding words, deleting others, changing tenses, in some cases inadvertently changing meanings. This is an extremely serious breach of a cardinal rule of the profession. While sympathetic to modernizing spelling, punctuation (where the meaning is clear), and capitalization, this reviewer (along with most historians) believes that no other changes are permissible.

Typical examples of the problems that Levy's tampering with quotations has caused are the following: on p. 235, Levy states from Goshen Monthly Meeting minutes (without adding that in accordance with Quaker policy, he is using initials rather than the offender's name) that Uwchlan Meeting complained of "M.M. for marriage by a Priest to one not a member of our society without his parents' consent, and of his brother George for accompanying him." The correct quote is: "Moses Martin for Accomplishing his marriage by the Assistance of A Priest to one not of our religious Society without her parents consent he having been precautiond to the contrary wherefore this meeting appts Cad. Jones & Noble Butlar to draw up a Testimony agt him & acquaint him therewith. The same frds are appd to deal with his Bro. George Martin for Accompanying in the above disorder." On p. 186, Levy cites a letter from George Rosse, written on January 22, 1712, part of which quote Levy separates by ellipses to indicate an omission. In fact, the words preceding the ellipses are from the cited letter, but the words after the ellipses are from a letter written by Rosse to another individual on December 30, 1712. Finally, there is a letter from Thomas Ellis to George Fox which graphically illustrates the carelessness found in this book. In note 70 of chapter 3, Levy cites the letter as written on June 14, 1685. But note 12 of chapter 4 cites the same letter as written on June 12, 1685; in the text to that note the letter is given as 1686. In fact, it was written on June 13, 1685. When turning to Levy's lengthy quotation from that letter on p. 129, one finds 48 differences in wording, often significant, between Levy's version and the original.

This reviewer sympathizes with a fellow historian, who was no doubt under academic and publisher pressure to produce a significant and original interpretation, and who was probably tired of reworking a manuscript that

took a decade from dissertation to book. Nonetheless, there is no excuse for such shoddy craftsmanship. Fair or not, the reader must question whether Levy's quantitative base suffers from the same malaise.

*Historical Society of Pennsylvania*

CRAIG W. HORLE

Reply to Craig Horle's review of *Quakers and the American Family*.

Craig Horle's review raises serious issues about accuracy, methodology, and the use of sources in Pennsylvania and Quaker social history. The underlying issue concerns the kinds of people that historians should and can study in order to understand what Quaker Pennsylvania history meant.

I want to thank Horle for pointing out several crudities and errors of transcription, citation, and modernization of the historical text. Despite the fact that the meanings of documents were not tampered with or misrepresented, such errors deserve criticism and should have been avoided. My study is based on some 453 reconstructions in England and Pennsylvania of Quaker families and the tracing of some 2,627 people through their wills, probate inventories, tax records, and local monthly meetings. The study involved intensive and lengthy work in many archives on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. Such an effort was necessary to do justice to the fullness of the Quakers' experience in England and Pennsylvania. I continue to believe that their experience is represented honestly, accurately, and with unprecedented thoroughness in *Quakers and the American Family*. I also believe that their experience, despite their initial material poverty and social powerlessness, is of signal importance in understanding what people constitute colonial Quaker Pennsylvania history and what that history truly meant, a controversial fact implied in Craig Horle's response.

The keepers of Quakerism too often have kept Quakers apart or aberrant from the main themes of American history. My approach not only reaches the whole population, instead of just its literary and mercantile elite, but also ironically stakes a claim for the significance of those seemingly insignificant Quakers at the very center of American history—the creation of American domesticity.

Thus, I do not believe that Horle's review is primarily a personal assault, though to be sure it questions my commitments without demonstrating, despite intense scrutiny, misreadings or distortions of evidence or even editorial errors whose correction would necessitate any important changes in my argument. He evades confronting almost all my major arguments and interpretations: on Quaker socio-linguistics, on Quaker piety, on the relationships in Quaker communities between family, economics, and meet-

ing leadership, on the Quaker impact on the Delaware Valley rural economy, and on the role of the Delaware Valley Quakers in the creation of the modern American family—and therefore makes little headway against my argument or interpretations. He presses tangential concerns instead; in so doing, he denies social historians' access to whole categories of evidence like monthly meeting memorials or ignores other sources and methods I use. He avoids the thickets of Quaker farmers' lives and purposes and chiefly confronts my arguments when the Quaker common folk trespass on the "official" issues and interpretations of Pennsylvania historiography: reasons for immigration, the Keithian schism, and the broader meanings of Quaker Pennsylvania history itself. Ironically, Horle thereby pays the book a poignant compliment by tacitly conceding the power of my reconstruction of the lives of these humble Quaker farmers to shift the paradigm and significance of Quaker Pennsylvania history in a populist direction that conflicts with his "alternative interpretation."

Horle explains Pennsylvania settlement and the Keithian schism as related responses to the spiritual and social problems of "the children of wealthy, powerful Quakers." He believes that the childrearing concerns of wealthy Quakers were central to Quaker history, but that in my study of ordinary Quakers I overstate "dramatically the significance of childrearing concerns. . . ." He wants to focus on the "malaise" of Quaker swells, while disavowing the pain of upland Quaker farmers who lost their children to "the world."

Nor is Horle wrong that his historiographical world is in danger of being turned upside-down. In truth, the descendants of those first, poor Quaker farmers in the Delaware Valley became, by the second half of the eighteenth century, among the most famous Americans in Continental Europe. Their families attracted Crèvecoeur to Pennsylvania to expound upon the true American farmer, and their republican vision later drew J.P. Brissot de Warville from Paris. These philosophes were far more interested in Quaker commoners than in wealthier Quaker merchants or politicians on whom historians have been so long fixated and who again monopolize the stage in Horle's "alternative interpretation."

Indeed, these philosophes were far more interested in ordinary Quaker farmers' households than in those of any other group of agricultural people in early America. Brissot characteristically spent several days and nights in the home of a Chester County farmer in order to digest its unusual domestic atmosphere and order. "In truth, I was never before so edified as I was in this house," he exclaimed. This celebratory theme of Quaker fond-fostering, companionate marriage, and moral autonomy was soon taken up by Thomas Clarkson in England, who recommended ordinary Quaker families as models for all English men and women, and later by New England reformers of

nineteenth-century American family life. The celebration of the Quaker family was rooted, however, in the recognition of the accomplishments of the majority of Quaker Pennsylvanians. These rural peoples developed an explicit form of domesticity that anticipated and partly inspired nineteenth-century practices.

With some recent, notable exceptions, the "official" issues of Pennsylvania Quaker history have been discussed and defined primarily in terms of, and in sources pertaining to, the Quaker mercantile elite, the wealthy circle of Friends around William Penn, and a relatively small number of influential Quaker ministers—the producers of virtually all the conventional literary sources that exist. The ethnographic family-community study allows retrieval of populations inarticulate and inaccessible in the political records and elite family papers on which most previous Quaker historians have depended. Indeed, the ethnographic family-community study has been a regular and valuable feature of New England and Chesapeake studies for a decade and more, though I think I have come to conclusions that scholars of those regions never did (thanks largely to the superior sources of the Delaware Valley). In any case, such studies of common people have been allowed to compete in the marketplace of historical meanings and significances with interpretations based chiefly on documents left by the elite. The same process needs to be encouraged in Pennsylvania Quaker history, hopefully with some mutual respect on both sides of the ensuing debate.

Thus, I hope the ground broken by *Quakers and the American Family* not only is scrutinized but also broadened and deepened, perhaps significantly modified, by refinement of its methodologies and assumptions, and especially by additional research at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and elsewhere on colonial rural Quaker families and communities in the Delaware Valley. Such rural families not only reared the overwhelming majority of colonial Pennsylvania Quakers but also authored one of the major stories of early American history.

*University of Massachusetts at Amherst*

BARRY LEVY

*Benjamin Franklin: Writings*. Edited by J.A. LEO LEMAY. (New York: The Library of America, 1987. 1605p. Chronology, note on the texts, index. \$30.00.)

The issue of the relation of what was taken to be Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography* to the actual text (or texts) that Franklin wrote or dictated is one that has vexed readers of that masterpiece for close to 200 years. It

seems safe to say, however, that it has been definitively settled for our time, if not for all, by the *Genetic Text* (1981) prepared by J.A. Leo Lemay and P.M. Zall. In 1986, these same editors reprinted their text in the valuable "Norton Critical Edition" series, making it available to general students as well as specialists, and enhancing that availability by the provision of a number of accompanying pieces that reflect the attitude towards Franklin of contemporaries who knew him, and the shifting nature of his reputation at the hands of critics from his day to ours. That same year, Lemay published *The Canon of Benjamin Franklin, 1722-1776*, in which he argued convincingly for Franklin's authorship of some fifty-seven pieces from *The New England Courant* and *The Pennsylvania Gazette* previously unattributed to him. Now in this edition, Lemay again presents the text of the *Autobiography* he and Zall established, together with some 1300 pages of selections, including the first reprintings of some of the pieces attributed to Franklin in *The Canon*.

It is a stunning edition, the best presentation of Franklin's writings ever to have appeared between one set of covers. The Yale edition of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, which commenced in 1959, now stands at twenty-six volumes. Lemay's selections get at the heart of the matter, amply revealing the statesman, scientist, inventor, philanthropist, businessman, and busybody. Above all, this book captures Franklin the writer, the first American master of modern prose, and very helpfully allows the reader to recognize the way in which Franklin's attainment of this literary stature is connected with Franklin's intimate knowledge not just of the way the print medium worked technically but also of the new audience it was calling into being. With regard to this latter point, Lemay reprints the texts of journalistic pieces as they appeared in the newspapers and magazines of the day and the texts of pamphlets as they appeared originally. Thus, the very physical appearance of the typography provides us with a continuous sense of Benjamin Franklin not just as a writer but as a writer for print.

To his day, most of Franklin's contemporaries wrote to an assumed audience of intellectual peers with specialized interests, and their writings were printed. Print, that is, was an effect of what they wrote. But Franklin wrote to the growing audience of intelligent, unspecialized laymen whom print was forming. Print, that is, was a cause of why he wrote as he wrote.

Both for the specialist who is acquiring the Yale *Papers* as they appear and the more general student of American life and letters whose shelf is more selective, this edition of Franklin's *Writings* is an essential acquisition, duplicated by nothing else in or out of print.

*The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*. Volume 26: *March 1 through June 30, 1778*. Edited by WILLIAM B. WILLCOX. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987. lxxiii, 756p. Illustrations, chronology, index. \$60.00.)

This volume of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* covers one of the most momentous episodes in Franklin's life and in that of the United States—the recognition of American independence by France, accomplished by the presentation of the American commissioners to Louis XVI on March 20, 1778. This meeting transformed Franklin from a favor-seeker to a de facto ambassador of a sovereign power (much to the chagrin of his jealous colleagues, John Adams and Arthur Lee) and increased the enormous volume of business that he transacted. The Franklin Papers editors have been able, as a result, to cover only four months of the Doctor's life, March 1-June 30, 1778, in a volume of over 750 pages.

The editors have continued the procedures that they initiated when Franklin arrived in France. Letters to Franklin are grouped in various categories—commission seekers, emigrants, favor seekers, eulogists, etc.—and are summarized. Other letters of somewhat more importance are calendared. And letters written to and by the commissioners that have appeared in recent editions of the Adams Papers are abstracted. The loss to the reader from these efforts at editorial economy is slight and the editors should be encouraged to employ further strategies of compression. They are to be saluted for their industry and ingenuity in identifying the hosts of Franklin's French and European correspondents. Many are obscure, and the range of bibliographical resources consulted to bring them to life is remarkable. Probably no NHPRC-sponsored project (with the exception of the Jefferson Papers during their subject's French period) has encountered so many puzzles and overcome them so gloriously.

The exhilaration of recognition by Louis XVI must have been somewhat offset by Franklin's continuing difficulties during the period with Arthur Lee and his circle. There is new documentation in the volume that illustrates the development of the hostility between the Franklin-Deane camp and the Lees, a conflict that spread to the conduct of American commerce in French ports, to privateering and the maritime activities of John Paul Jones, and to accusations of spying and stockjobbing in England, and that sucked John Adams into its spiteful vortex when he arrived in France in April 1778. More pleasant, of course, was Franklin's robust social life that brought within his orbit intellectuals, aristocrats, and ladies such as Madame Brillion and Madame Helvetius (who appears only at the end of this volume).

Franklin and the United States are riding high in this volume and so are his editors. It is particularly distressing, therefore, to report that the

editor-in-chief of the project, William B. Willcox, died just after the annotation for the volume was completed. He could not have left a finer monument to his skill as a scholar and editor.

*Library of Congress*

JAMES H. HUTSON

*The Diary, and Life, of William Byrd II of Virginia, 1674-1744.* By KENNETH A. LOCKRIDGE. (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1987. xiv, 201p. Illustrations, chronology, index. \$19.95.)

William Byrd. The name evokes visions of that cultivated gentleman who lived splendidly at Westover in Virginia during the "golden age" before the Baptists and American Revolution forever transformed the Old Dominion. It was not always so. Byrd remained obscure until the rediscovery and publication of extant portions of his diaries and other works nearly half a century ago. Since then, he has been lionized as an epitome of his class or a progenitor of the southern literary tradition. Yet, to digest Byrd's manuscripts is to come away half sated. Byrd the diarist always kept himself just beyond his reader's reach, while Byrd the *litteratus* wrote more as a mannered Augustan than a rustic Virginian. Interpreters who attempted to integrate the two into an entire man have usually retreated in frustration. Not so Mr. Lockridge, who confidently sets out to map the whole Byrd.

Chart the "virtually unexplored" dimensions of Byrd's "inner life," he argues, and you come upon a life that "glows with meanings that need to be uttered" (pp. vi, vii). The diaries are the key to the interior man, but they are encoded in a way that usually defies modern efforts to read them, and that is why others have misportrayed him. To decode them, Lockridge turns for insight to theories from cultural anthropology, literary criticism, psychohistory, and social psychology. Their encryptions contain not one but three codes—the shorthand code in which Byrd wrote, the behavioral code of the daily routine, and the emotional code of an eighteenth-century gentleman—all of which speak to the colonel's progress to gentility and the toll his quest exacted from him. For Byrd, like his kith and kin among the Virginia gentry, dependence on slavery and an exaggerated model of the English gentleman to sustain his place exacted a high cost indeed because it led finally to destruction, cultural as well as personal.

Cast more as an extended meditation than a full-length biography, *The Diary, and Life, of William Byrd* advances no new documentation about Byrd or his literary output, as Lockridge is quick to acknowledge. Its true claim to notice clearly comes from his reading of the known evidence. The

interpretation, written in an easy, well-paced style, is sure to spark a measure of controversy as readers will quarrel both with the rendition and the approach.

The book ascribes greater primacy to Byrd's play for the governorship of the Old Dominion and his disputes with Alexander Spotswood in shaping Anglo-Virginia politics than do others that have treated those episodes. Byrd also comes across as an emotional cripple, always in competition with his father's memory. He matures through life, but the presumed malformations of personality never quite disappear. Is this the whole Byrd? That depends on the reader's willingness to buy Lockridge's portrait. If his approach to the diaries and how to read them are rejected, then his perspective disappears, and observers are no closer to understanding Byrd than before they pondered this picture.

In the end, Lockridge demanded too much from Byrd. By picturing Byrd as a symbol for his age, Lockridge, like scholars before him, has freighted the master of Westover with a weight he will not bear. Quite possibly, William Byrd was no more than a witty, lusty, ambitious, and straightforward colonial gentleman who kept a diary, dabbled at writing, and politicked as befitted someone of his station. After all, did not Sigmund Freud counsel students of personality to be mindful that sometimes a cigar is just a cigar?

*University of New Orleans*

WARREN M. BILLINGS

*The Devil in the Shape of a Woman: Witchcraft in Colonial New England.* By CAROL F. KARLSEN. (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1987. xvii, 360p. Tables, appendix, index. \$22.95.)

Why did more women than men become ministers of the devil? No one in colonial New England explicitly answered this question, but this interesting study focuses on an undeniably central fact about witchcraft: nearly 80 percent of the accused were women, and almost half of the men involved collaborated with a woman.

Emphasizing the connection between gender and witchcraft, Carol F. Karlsen develops a collective biographical profile of all of the groups of participants in witchcraft cases, scrutinizes the substantive themes evident in these court records, and analyzes contemporary printed materials, usually written by Puritan ministers, on the subjects of women and witchcraft. What emerges from these investigations is the relative powerlessness of those accused of witchcraft and especially those tried and convicted of that crime. Karlsen also stresses the fear of the sexual power that was believed to be

inherent in women's nature, but the evidence supporting this theme is quite modest.

Quantitative analysis of the attributes of witches yields considerable evidence for powerlessness and marginality as characteristic markers of witches. Relative to their numbers, women under forty were rarely accused and even more rarely tried as witches. Older women, those over age sixty, were more likely to be witches than middle-aged women, as were currently unmarried women compared to married women. Additionally, women who did not have sons or brothers also appear to be more likely to fall victim to witchcraft accusations than were women without male kin protectors.

However, the conclusions possible from the analysis of patterns in collective biography are limited, both because there are too few cases in various subcategories of the accused for statistical certainty and because the content and completeness of each biography depends on the type and coverage of the sources that can be linked to the accused individuals. These patterns suggest complementary interpretations of witchcraft to that provided by gender. Familial and economic marginality as well as a troubled life or troublesome behavior also characterized some men, but these problems when experienced by men did not trigger witchcraft accusations to the same degree that they did for women.

Karlsen is surely correct in relating the peculiar vulnerability of women to allegations of witchcraft, the assumptions about women's nature, and the presumptions about women's roles advanced by the Puritan version of Christianity. In this view, a woman, Eve, was especially responsible for the introduction of sin into the world. It was this religious context that made suspects of women who lacked measurable markers of familial, economic, or behavioral deviance; by noting the existence of accusations against seemingly ordinary women, Karlsen restores some of the terror of the hunt for witches in seventeenth-century New England that has been lost in recent treatments by historians who draw upon theories from the social sciences.

Karlsen's explanations for what might be called the demand for witches are more successful than her treatment of the supply of women into that role. Like most historians, she regards categories such as gender, sexuality, class, and race as genuine explanatory entities and tends to treat religion as a derivative phenomenon that masks the more fundamental aspects of social structure. Following the devil, like following God, was a religious activity, and women were more likely than men to make themselves witches for the same reasons they were more likely than men to become church members. Karlsen is too reluctant, in my opinion, to regard the decline of Puritanism, especially among the elite who controlled the formal institutions of New England, as a sufficient explanation of the disappearance of witchcraft prosecutions after the Salem debacle of 1692-93. In the epilogue she instead

endorses the view that the image of women-as-evil was successfully projected onto black and poor white women by the early nineteenth century, a deduction about negative reference groups that does not gain much persuasiveness by its frequent repetition by historians.

Still, this thoroughly researched and cogently written book successfully reminds us that people in seventeenth-century New England acted on the belief that the devil did appear "in the shape of a woman."

*University of Illinois at Chicago*

DANIEL SCOTT SMITH

*Custom and Contract: Household, Government, and the Economy in Colonial Pennsylvania.* By MARY M. SCHWEITZER. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987. xii, 271p. Tables, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$32.00.)

In *Custom and Contract*, Mary Schweitzer translates the economic practices of early Pennsylvania into the language of modern neoclassical economics. She points out that "while production *within* the household was structured along traditional lines, trading *between* households took place [in] . . . a highly developed market economy" (p. 21). This market orientation brought an increasing diversification of productive activity and a rise in economic well-being. Between 1711 and 1755, the proportion of artisans rose steadily, as did the average value of personal estates in Chester County probate inventories.

Schweitzer ascribes this prosperity to many factors, including the buoyant transatlantic market for wheat. Her major contribution, however, is a comprehensive and insightful analysis of the economic policies of the proprietors and legislature. Some policies had an aristocratic cast. At first, the Penns forbade settlement on their extensive manor lands. Faced by widespread squatting, they turned to short-term leases that gave few advantages to tenants. The proprietors likewise sold their lands subject to an annual quitrent and, after Thomas Penn's arrival in 1733, often collected these quasi-feudal dues.

More policies had democratic implications. The Penns sold vast quantities of land at reasonable prices, encouraging widespread property ownership. Moreover, most tenants held long-term leases and enjoyed the right to sell their improvements. These practices promoted economic "growth, equity, and efficiency," as did the activities of the General Loan Office. The office lent modest sums (averaging £65) to yeomen farmers and artisans, taking their landed property as collateral. Most borrowers invested these funds in

productive goods—new equipment, barns, and livestock. Equally important, the paper currency issued by the loan office increased productivity by facilitating market exchange. Finally, Schweitzer argues that legislation mandating the inspection and labeling of flour gave Pennsylvania farmers a competitive edge in the West Indian market. “Explicit Pennsylvania economic policy appears to have been successful . . .,” she concludes, and “the period 1725 to 1755 was characterized by phenomenal economic growth” (p. 217).

*Custom and Contract* is a fine contribution to the economic history of early America. Schweitzer’s conclusions are based on detailed research in primary sources and are generally sound. Nonetheless, she has not realized the full potential of this topic, for three reasons:

First, *Custom and Contract* has a curiously old-fashioned “institutional” organization. Each chapter examines the economic policies of a single institution: the household, proprietorship, land office, and legislature. This organization inhibits a full understanding of the relationships *among* these economic actors. Why, for example, did prosperous farmers in Chester County plant *fewer* acres of wheat in 1750 than they had in 1720 (p. 67), given the alleged success of Pennsylvania’s wheat inspection legislation?

Second, Schweitzer’s handling of chronology is flawed. Her final chapters clearly establish the 1720s as the crucial decade of policy innovation. Yet the narrative only hints at the complex interaction of economic circumstance and political creativity that produced this noteworthy result. Moreover, she inexplicably ends her account in 1755. What was the fate of these (or other) policies in the turbulent and crucially important final decades of the colonial era?

Finally, *Custom and Contract* does not provide a conceptual model of “political economy” of early Pennsylvania, but only a catalogue of its diverse aspects: the private property and family labor of the household economy, the mixed aristocratic and capitalist features of the Penns’ land policies, the legislature’s mercantilist-oriented inspection and regulatory laws, and the capital- and market-forming results of the land office. How do these partly contradictory, partly complementary practices fit together? What ultimately is the conceptual “plot” that describes the inner dynamics of the economy of eighteenth-century America?

*Custom and Contract* raises crucial questions, but its answers are less than satisfactory.

*University of Maryland,  
College Park*

JAMES A. HENRETTA

*The Townshend Duties Crisis: The Second Phase of the American Revolution, 1767-1773.* By PETER D.G. THOMAS. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. 282p. Select bibliography, index. \$52.00.)

Continuing the story he began with *British Politics and the Stamp Act Crisis* (1975), Peter D.G. Thomas once again takes us to the center of British decision-making on the eve of the American Revolution. The very richness of Thomas's book makes it difficult to read and difficult to review. He provides a thorough account of the arguments used by and information available to the cabinet, opposition leaders, and Parliament at every key moment of the colonial crisis from adoption of the Townshend Acts in 1767 to the shipment of East India Tea to North America in 1773. Readers unfamiliar with the intricacies of factional alignments during George III's troubled first decade may well find themselves lost. Furthermore, Thomas places the American debate in the context of other issues which vexed Britain. This is crucial in demonstrating the relative importance of North America at any given time, but adds layers to an even more complex story.

Yet, for those with the background knowledge and fortitude to work their way through Thomas's narrative, the rewards will prove ample indeed. Along the way, one learns all sorts of obscure yet important items. Charles Townshend expressed ministerial consensus rather than personal eccentricity in advancing the duties which bore his name. Many scholars will be surprised that the removal in 1768 of Virginia's absentee governor Lord Jeffrey Amherst—a significant concession to the colonies, the ministry thought— attracted more attention in Parliament than sending troops to Boston. Thomas elucidates the effect on American policy of the East India Company's fortunes, John Wilkes's political career, western land speculation, and the Falkland Islands crisis of 1771 not simply by quoting the more eloquent opposition spokesmen, but by demonstrating specific maneuverings and responses of cabinet ministers and other leaders. Thomas's most significant point is that removing all the Townshend duties except the Tea Tax in 1770 cost the government nothing and was not a concession to the colonies. Only the Tea Tax was worth the effort to collect it, and it was intended from the first to pay the salaries of colonial officials to free them from dependence on obstreperous lower houses. This brief review can only hint at the wealth of information Thomas provides based on his detailed examination of parliamentary debates and contemporary correspondence and memoirs.

Thomas's general interpretation of British policy during these years stresses fundamental consensus on the key issue—the right of Parliament to legislate for the colonies in all cases whatsoever. On this there was little disagreement. Thomas argues convincingly that the so-called Friends of America in the

Rockingham and Chatham factions were more concerned with staking out an American position of their own to embarrass the ministry than with championing the rights the colonists believed they possessed. Only a handful of politically marginal radicals really sympathized with the Americans. Given the factional turmoil of these years, the taxes and commercial legislation Parliament adopted did not represent an "American policy," but rather a consensus required to conciliate powerful individuals in rapidly shifting coalitions. In Thomas's narrative, Lord Hillsborough's tenacity and Lord North's politics of intelligent compromise emerge head and shoulders above the squabbling of their colleagues.

Thomas's essentially pro-ministerial interpretation is a necessary corrective to pro-American caricatures of British administration. By presenting the ministry as men who seriously cared about and debated colonial policy, and were determined that the empire retain some authority over its outlying parts, Thomas has given us Whitehall's perspective on the collapse of the first British Empire about as well as it could be presented.

In light of Thomas's achievement, it might seem churlish to note two omissions, but these are disturbing. First, there is now a considerable literature on British high politics and the Revolution: it would have been helpful if Thomas had situated his work with respect to the historiography, thereby making it clear where he agrees or disagrees with his predecessors, where he is summarizing known truths, and where he is breaking new ground. Second, Thomas's account of the colonial side of the Revolution is based largely on the correspondence of imperial officials, whom he regards as harassed, conscientious civil servants simply doing their jobs. He may well be right, even about the Boston customs commissioners. But a fine book would have been even better if he had treated these transplanted Englishmen as important political actors themselves. But one can only ask so much of a historian. In his primary field of British colonial administration, Thomas has written an excellent book.

*Pennsylvania State University,  
Ogontz Campus*

WILLIAM PENCAK

*King and Congress: The Transfer of Political Legitimacy, 1774-1776.* By JERRILYN GREENE MARSTON. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987. xiii, 462p. Appendix, index. \$29.95.)

Jerrilyn Marston's thesis is novel and arresting: the remarkable development of the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1776 is more adequately illustrated by describing the way it assumed and exercised executive au-

thorities that had been—in the Old Empire—found in the Crown than by locating it as a legislative body, too near the vortex of republicanism. And, as the title of the book, *King and Congress*, suggests the thesis, so the subtitle, *The Transfer of Political Legitimacy*, connotes a principal function of the Congress in its acceptance and application of executive responsibilities. In its executive role, the Congress provided the bridge from old to new, carrying “Americans to independence and beyond.” The result was “a functional union of the colonies . . . based on the extensive executive powers vested without controversy, in the Congress” (p. 182).

The author constructs her argument by describing and analyzing the manner in which the Continental Congress, starting in September 1774, seized and institutionalized political authority, transforming the “transitory convention of 1774 into a permanent continental government” (p. 82). She describes major areas of executive action; these form topics for separate chapters—the Association, the army and the navy, early federation schemes, management of foreign affairs, domestic concerns (such as the post office, Indians, boundary disputes), and authorizing revolutionary governments in the states. In these areas Congress assumed the previous role of the British Crown, and in doing so, it demonstrated as much (if not more) capacity for executive initiatives as it did for legislative functions. Conversely, powers that had been parliamentary—“the power to tax, to regulate both among the colonies and with foreign nations, and to design or alter the internal constitutions of individual colonies—were just as firmly allocated to the states” (p. 304).

To understand a significant subtlety of the argument, the reader must remember the author’s warning (p. 8) that she has concentrated “upon the expectations and beliefs of the governed” that “there is little said about the delegates’ *own* view of their role.” She explains: “I do not contend, therefore, that the delegates thought of themselves as primarily an executive body, and, indeed, there is surprisingly little evidence about their institutional self-perception.” It is the constituencies—the states and the people within—who articulate and encourage and accept the appropriateness of the executive congressional roles.

Readers ought to be prepared to accept the awkward (perhaps desirable) scheme of redefinition of the terms “radical,” “moderate,” and “conservative,” chapter by chapter, a style borrowed from Richard A. Ryerson. Precisely because the twenty-plus months canvassed in this study were the central months of revolution leading to independence, significant shifts and alterations in attitude and position, sometimes issue by issue, make uniform labels imprecise and images blurred. The corrective is useful, but somewhat frustrating. A final caution: Marston’s thesis does not have to be thought of as displacing all previous explanations of these complex, significant events.

We do not have to reject the commitment to republicanism in the local and state governments, and in the Congresses, in order to accept the idea that the Congresses also provided executive leadership.

With that, then, this assessment: This is an unusually challenging book, demonstrating anew the way in which a new question asked of old sources can yield an entirely different dimension to the way we understand the past. What other two-year period in our national history has been so fully analyzed as the years 1774 to 1776? While Marston uses and cites—and sometimes comments on—recent interpretations of other scholars, the basic sources she exploits also have been exploited over many years by many others. What Marston has done is to ask us to look at a familiar agency—the Continental Congress—from a radically different perspective. When we do so, we are in possession of a rather more complex but also more satisfying understanding of the significance of that agency and its role in the creation of the American Republic.

*Case Western Reserve University*

CARL UBBELOHDE

*The Founders' Constitution*. Volume 1: *Major Themes*. Edited by PHILIP B. KURLAND and RALPH LERNER. (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987. xiii, 713p. Index of constitutional provisions, table of cases, index of authors and documents. Cloth, \$49.95; paper, \$24.50.)

Historians generally view the Constitution as a plan of government which, if successful over the long term in providing a stable political order, is nevertheless best understood as an ad hoc response to immediate problems caused by conflicting political, social, and economic interests. In a typical expression of this view, criticizing the notion that deliberate rational design played a significant role in shaping the document, Gordon S. Wood has written: "Yet we must remember that the formation of the Constitution was very much a historical event and like all great events a product not as much of reasoned purpose as of complicated historical circumstances and clashing views and interests." *The Founders' Constitution*, edited by Philip B. Kurland and Ralph Lerner, challenges the historicist assumptions on which Wood's admonition rests. Arguing for a broader view of historical causation going beyond the formulaic invoking of interest and ideology that serves as an explanatory strategy for most historians today, Lerner and Kurland suggest that superior intellect, theoretical and practical reason, and a sound understanding of principles of government guided the framers of the Constitution.

*The Founders' Constitution: Major Themes*, is the first volume in a five-volume anthology of documents drawn principally from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that are intended to provide "a general view of the state of the question that ultimately took the form of a specific phrase or clause in the Constitution." The work is conventionally historical in the sense that it presents the Constitution as a reflection of controversies over political theory and governmental practice in England and America in the early modern period. The work differs from current professional historiography, however, insofar as the editors include in their conception of history considerations of what might be called truth and transcendence. Thus Lerner and Kurland state: "This is an anthology of reasons and of the political arguments that thoughtful men and women drew from, and used to support, those reasons. We believe that those reasons and political arguments have enduring interest and significance for anyone who purports to think about constitutional government in general and the Constitution of the United States in particular" (p. xi). The distinctive feature of their historical interpretation is found in their conclusion that the Constitution was "the precipitate of hard thinking (and, yes, hard bargaining) by men of remarkable intelligence and seriousness" (p. xiii).

A second problem of concern to historians that the anthology deals with is the question of original intent in constitutional interpretation. "By immersing ourselves in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century documents," the editors write, "we are in effect seeking to recover an 'original understanding' of those who agitated for, proposed, argued over, and ultimately voted for or against the Constitution of 1787." And why seek to recover original intent? Lerner and Kurland do so for the sake of good government, to assist in detecting the "simplistic truisms" that pass for political thought today, and in the belief that "the Constitution still matters—as a framework, as a statement of broad purposes, as a point of recurring reference, as a legitimation of further developments, as a restraint on the overbearing and the righteous . . ." (p. xii).

The volume is organized topically, according to the major subjects identified directly or indirectly in the preamble to the Constitution. The eighteen chapters include such topics as republican government, union, federal versus consolidated government, separation of powers, representation, rights, equality, and property. Concise introductory essays summarize debate on the issue dealt with in each chapter.

Despite the general assumption derived from progressive historiography that social and economic forces determined the outcome of the Constitutional Convention, no volume of source materials intended to illustrate that point of view exists. Lerner and Kurland cause us to consider the weakness in the progressive account by providing a very impressive documentary inter-

pretation that argues against a socioeconomic explanation of the Founding. Their work points to the conclusion that when people at the time talked about union, republicanism, liberty, and the other issues treated in this anthology, they were giving an honest account of the ends, purposes, and aspirations that led to the making of the Constitution. These were the reasons that led to the establishment of a constitutional government in the United States.

*University of Maryland,  
College Park*

HERMAN BELZ

*The Thinking Revolutionary: Principle and Practice in the New Republic.* By RALPH LERNER. (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987. xv, 238p. Works cited, index. \$24.95.)

This volume contains a set of seven essays on subjects ranging from the political thought of John Adams, to the role of the Supreme Court in setting the limits of republican government, to Alexis de Tocqueville's reflection on the problem of race. All of the essays are gracefully written; most contain original insights; and some (the Tocqueville essay, for example) propose original interpretations of familiar material.

Ralph Lerner of the University of Chicago's Committee on Social Thought has clearly been bitten by the bug of American constitutionalism. A political philosopher by training, Lerner has turned his very considerable powers of analysis and his lovely prose style in the direction of American materials—and to very good effect for the most part, although, as is so often true of this sort of book, the essays are of mixed quality.

Essays on Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson offer little that is new or provocative, and the essay on Adams draws so heavily upon Gordon Wood that there seems little justification for publishing it. Lerner offers little evidence of having immersed himself in the sources—either primary or secondary—and the essays that result are therefore more smart than scholarly, more clever than learned. Readers and users of *The Founders' Constitution*, edited by Lerner and Philip Kurland, will know that his familiarity with the sources is probably much broader than most of these essays indicate. One can only wish that this erudition had been brought to bear more fully on the subjects examined here.

In a peculiar way, Lerner's failure to read more widely in the secondary literature has led him seriously astray. He has read Bernard Bailyn and Wood on the Revolution, but not apparently Edmund Morgan or Eric Foner. He has read Jesse Lemisch, but not Gary Nash. He seems utterly

innocent of the debates surrounding the work of Drew McCoy and Joyce Appleby. He has not read John Murrin on the Revolutionary settlements in England and America. To note such omissions is not merely the cavil of an obsessive reader of footnotes. Lerner's superficial grounding in the historiography as well as his failure to make fuller use of primary materials has led him into interpretive errors to which he might otherwise have been alert.

In Lerner's hands, the Revolution and the drafting of the Constitution become leisurely exercises in rational theoretical discourse. One need not accept a socioeconomic interpretation of the Revolutionary era to acknowledge that the thinking and policy formulations of the Founding Fathers were in some measure influenced by a society undergoing significant turmoil. Moreover, the outcomes of the struggles of the eighteenth century, as innumerable scholars have shown, were complex. It is true that Adams and Jefferson and Franklin were "thinking revolutionaries," but Lerner's inevitable implication is that most revolutionaries are not "thinking" people at all. We can reject such a notion categorically, but it is demonstrably true that there were other thinking revolutionaries in eighteenth-century America than the ones Lerner focuses upon. Not only that, but they were thinking some very different thoughts than the members of Lerner's pantheon. Lerner's approach thus gives a deceptively smooth texture to a sometimes cacophonous din of clashing personalities, ideas, and social forces.

Lerner is at his best when he is reading original texts on significant issues, as in the essays on the role of the Court and on Tocqueville's views on race. There is much for other scholars to quarrel with, of course, but they will have to meet Lerner on the most suitable grounds for debate: the sources themselves rather than a superficial reading of secondary materials. This is, in other words, a provocative and sometimes maddening book, but it is carried along by Lerner's graceful writing and, in places, by his sharply focused and original readings of his evidence.

*American Council of Learned Societies*

DOUGLAS GREENBERG

*Federalism: The Founders' Design.* By RAOUL BERGER. (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987. viii, 223p. Appendix, bibliography, index of cases, index. \$16.95.)

Raoul Berger, more than any other post-World War II scholar, has consistently invoked a conservative jurisprudential philosophy to attack modern liberal constitutionalism. Along with Judge Robert Bork, the recently defeated nominee for the Supreme Court, and Gary McDowell, a political

scientist and former aide to Attorney General Edwin Meese, Berger has fashioned an impressive body of scholarship that hails the virtues of original intent and condemns what he views as the unwarranted intervention by unelected federal judges in public policy. This latest book, which treats the historical foundations of federalism, was seemingly intended to serve as a capstone to his earlier work. Federalism is one of the distinctive features of the American constitutional system, and much of the controversy over judicial review, the scope of the executive privilege, impeachment, and the death penalty (all topics of previous books by Berger and of considerable writing by Bork and McDowell) turn to varying degrees on one's assessment of the proper relationship of national to state authority.

Berger challenges conventional wisdom about federalism. He insists, quite correctly, that the states preceded the Union and that in forming the Constitution the framers intended to surrender only specifically defined areas of responsibility to the new national government. Indeed, Berger resurrects the concept of dual federalism, a notion largely exploded by the Roosevelt Court and its successors. Dual federalism meant that the national and state governments had mutually exclusive spheres of governmental responsibility in which they alone were sovereign. Berger does not develop a comprehensive history of federalism in reinvigorating this long dormant concept; instead, he adopts a topical approach, challenging the modern Supreme Court's interpretation of the interstate commerce and general welfare clauses of the Constitution. The former, according to Berger, was never intended by the framers to authorize federal intrusion into the state control of domestic matters, such as criminal justice and civil rights. Berger chastises the Court for relying on the commerce clause to seek social objectives, such as racial desegregation, that should have been achieved in a true democratic fashion through legislative action. The high court has done equally great damage through its interpretation of the general welfare clause which it has used to confer, in Berger's view, virtually uncircumscribed power on Congress to spend and tax. Berger argues that the framers intended the Tenth Amendment as a meaningful limitation on the power of national government and that modern-day justices, in reckless disregard of the framers' intentions, have belittled "the Amendment as inconsequential, 'redundant,' a 'constitutional tranquilizer, and empty declaration'" (p.77). Rather, Berger concludes, James Madison, the principal architect of the American federal system, had a less expansive view of the general welfare clause and a broader understanding of the limitations imposed by the Tenth Amendment than have modern Supreme Court justices and liberal legal academics.

Scholars will find nothing either new or surprising about Berger's latest contribution, much of which he has argued in his earlier books. If anything,

Berger has used *Federalism: The Founders' Design* to strike back at his critics. Thus, in a book devoted to *federalism*, Berger has included an appendix that deals at considerable length with H. Jefferson Powell's brilliant *Harvard Law Review* critique of the original intention arguments. At the same time, Berger ignores (there is not a single citation) the powerful scholarship of Harry Scheiber, Tony Freyer, and Charles McCurdy, among the leading historical interpreters of American federalism. While Berger is as argumentative (in the best sense of that word) as ever, he is neither as eloquent nor as trenchant as in the past, and the already suspect case for original intent as the sole basis of contemporary judicial action suffers accordingly.

*University of Florida*

KERMIT L. HALL

*Contested Truths: Keywords in American Politics Since Independence.* By DANIEL T. RODGERS. (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1987. x, 270p. Guide to further reading, index. \$19.95.)

This book by Daniel T. Rodgers, so rich, so inventive, and so contemporary in its conception, nonetheless forcibly recalls Richard Hofstadter's *The American Political Tradition* (1948). Indeed, *Contested Truths* is the best synthesis and interpretation of American political ideas since the work of Hofstadter. Both *The American Political Tradition* and *Contested Truths* are rather brief, given their grand themes. Both bristle with ideas and insights about American politics and culture, while proposing an interpretation of American political life that suggests a disturbing weakness of American public culture. Yet these two historians have proceeded quite differently. Hofstadter used a biographical approach, treating words very skeptically, as ideology in a Mannheimian sense. Rodgers focuses on words, not persons. He treats "key words" in political talk as historical action. Rather than seeking either to discount or to specify the essential meaning of political words, Rodgers explicates their use. Although one sees evidence of certain contemporary thinkers in the background of Rodgers's work, most notably Raymond Williams (whose concept of "keywords" Rodgers borrows), what is striking is how clearly Rodgers fits into a philosophical tradition established by William James and John Dewey. It is intellectual history in the tradition of American pragmatism.

Rodgers's discussion of natural rights reveals his method—and telegraphs most of his overall thesis. Instead of a genealogical history of the term, he shows how it served the purposes of the American revolutionaries and how they used it. He also shows how it was later limited in its implication, only to be recovered again by workingmen, land reformers, slavery opponents,

and feminists in the Jacksonian era. And then he shows how in the Civil War era the language of rights, at least in its democratic implications, was again displaced.

In keeping with his emphasis on use rather than meaning, Rodgers insists that the meaning and use of these words is contested. Words thus have careers in the language of American politics, and there is a typical career for nearly all of Rodgers's words: adaptation, usually in response to a serious political problem; expansion, usually making it useful for new groups with new democratic claims; resistance, as the elite shifts the terms of political language to prevent undue extension of democratic claims. It is a depressing story, however brilliantly told. Likewise, his concluding reflections on the peculiar qualities of American political language: he claims, with considerable justification, that Americans have characteristically and distinctively been able to give vitalizing energy to individualistic political words but have been notably unable to give real life and force to political words representing commonweal or the public.

Rodgers has, however, written with such concision that it is hard to appraise both his most important points and his method. The social elements of the contest over words are left rather vague, even stereotypical. The elite and the democratic challengers are both shadowy actors, too much so for a book so Deweyan in its understanding of the making and unmaking of political truths. And we get little sense of the different readings different social groups may have given to these words, something we must know if we are to understand the play of power and consent in the politics of these words. One wants to know more of the details of who and what is in conflict; then we would be better positioned to assess the method and the validity of his claim (implicitly challenging Hofstadter) that the elasticity of our political words both masked and generated conflict.

By concentrating on only seven words (utility, natural rights, the people, government, the state, interests, and freedom), treated in roughly chronological order (in terms of their emergence at the center of American political talk), Rodgers achieves a remarkable synthetic reach. With this erudite, humane, and continuously good-humored book, Rodgers has made a major contribution to intellectual history and to American historiography generally. It is further evidence, along with a few other recent books, of the recovery of American intellectual history. This field, which even before the challenge of social history had nearly self-destructed, is reaching again, after the fashion of Hofstadter, for a larger historiographical terrain, engaging large questions of politics and culture with confidence and effect.

*The Road to Mobocracy: Popular Disorder in New York City, 1763-1834.* By PAUL A. GILJE. (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1987. xvi, 315p. Illustrations, tables, maps, figures, appendix, bibliography, note on sources, index. Cloth, \$32.50; paper, \$9.95.)

In light of the fact that most of the historical scholarship on crowd activity in America has been confined to either the Revolutionary or the Jacksonian era, Paul Gilje's book is an important one. The first major study of its subject to bridge these periods, it reminds historians of the fundamental ideological and social transformation that occurred between them. Resting on an analysis of hundreds of riots and disturbances, it is a major contribution to the study of popular disorder. It is also in part a study of policing, of political cohesion, of republican ideology, and of social change as well. Moreover, it lifts its subject into a sophisticated explanatory framework, avoiding the partisan biases and simple moral judgments of contemporaries and historians alike. All in all, it is a model of what placing a subject in its social context truly means and of how social history can approach a history of society. This very strength, however, inherits other difficulties about what it is that a "social order" consists of, about the whole issue of class and social relations, and perhaps as well about the writing of history from the detached heights of social scientific observation.

Gilje demonstrates that "changes in rioting, and . . . changes in the response to rioting" occurred between 1763 and 1834 and explains them "as a function of broader social, cultural, and ideological transformations." There was a gradual shift in crowd activity from its traditional role as an enforcer of community norms in a "single-interest" society to a violent and unpredictable force expressing the prejudices and animosities of a "pluralistic" and fractured society. Through a precise and revealing analysis of Revolutionary, ethnic, racial, social, religious, and working-class riots, Gilje traces the disintegration of the eighteenth-century crowd and at the same time the decomposition of eighteenth-century republican society and thought. Many of the disturbances he studies are virtually unknown to historians and are reconstructed through painstaking research in court records and bail bonds, constituting one of the book's great strengths.

The other strength is interpretive. This is not a simple story of the "decline of community." Rather, animosities previously contained within the old order were laid bare in the new one. Corporate society was not without its conflicts and divisions, just as "middle-class culture" had its share of inconsistencies and hypocrisies. Gilje attributes the growing violence of the crowd not to one or another social or moral flaw but to the breakdown of traditional political and economic relationships.

Nowhere does Gilje trumpet these virtues. At the same time, neither does he examine his own assumptions, and the book's incongruities and silences relate just to this posture of detachment. While Gilje draws on "modern studies of popular disorder in Europe and America," he treats them in a synthetic way. There is a difference between E.P. Thompson and the social structural approach to class which Gilje seems to employ but does not identify as such. Hence, "Class" appears inexplicably as the organizing category of the third part of the book (after "Traditions" and "Community in Conflict") as if it were an invention of nineteenth-century social relations or a synonym for the "labor actions" of that era. Is class a factor to be placed alongside others such as ethnicity and race, or is it the way society works? Does it refer to the content of disputes, or to the social relations that shape them? Gilje does not explain his organizational and conceptual strategy.

Distant though he is from some partisan entanglements, Gilje is not immune from others. Granted, this is a study of "the road to mobocracy." A significant development, perhaps it was the outcome of democracy's degeneration, perhaps of authority's as well. Yet Gilje allows the fearful perceptions of contemporaries such as Fisher Ames and William Osborn Stoddard to shape the book's theme. It is a story informed by conservative apprehensions of democracy gone out of control. In this light the politicization of ordinary people appears as a temporary accomplishment of the Revolution. Rather incongruously, while class is making its appearance, citizenship and democratic political consciousness are receding into the distance.

Perhaps these inconsistencies have another source. "Social order" and "disorder" are, after all, transhistorical abstractions that are incompatible with the kind of sensitivity to historical specificity and context that Gilje clearly exhibits. The question this book raises for the social historian of the crowd therefore remains unresolved: is it class relations fully understood or is it received models of society as an organism that better captures the pastness of the past and the dynamics of social relations and social change?

*Saint Mary's University, Halifax*

RICHARD TWOMEY

*To Their Own Soil: Agriculture in the Antebellum North.* By JEREMY ATACK and FRED BATEMAN. (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1987. xi, 322p. Tables, appendixes, bibliography, index. \$29.95.)

This volume by two economists fills a long-standing void in agricultural history by applying the concepts and methods of economics to nineteenth-

century northern agriculture, something done heretofore mainly for the South. The authors' principal interest is in exploring the extent to which the antebellum ideal of egalitarianism succeeded on northern farms, along with related questions about the productivity and profitability of agriculture. But the scope of this book extends beyond economics or even agriculture, because there is new information here on population, migration, fertility, and a number of other areas.

Although the title suggests that the book covers a rather wide period, in fact it is concentrated on 1859-1860, the years covered by the 1860 census. There is little sense of development over time, especially compared with earlier American agriculture. The authors show a wide acquaintance with secondary literature on agriculture during the period, but their primary data is taken mainly from the 102 sample northern rural townships chosen at random a few years ago by Bateman and James D. Foust for computer input. The sample covers all the households in those townships—some 20,000—from the agricultural and population censuses. This is a broad but somewhat spotty selection. Four of the six New England townships, for example, come from New Hampshire. Indiana is represented by seventeen while Ohio, with nearly twice the population, has only four. In the case of Pennsylvania, only one of the eleven townships chosen is from the agriculturally rich southeast area. Fortunately, the authors are more interested in aggregate regional figures than the agriculture of individual states. Most of the book's comparisons are between the Northeast and the Midwest.

Atack and Bateman conclude that the egalitarian ideal "was more nearly realized in the rural northern United States than elsewhere in human history about which we have substantial knowledge" (p. 270). This finding is at odds with the recent work of social historians who have suggested that inequality increased in the antebellum years and that local elites continued their dominance through the Jacksonian era and beyond. But, based on census data, the authors show that farmers, at least, shared a similar level of wealth and that entry into farming was inexpensive enough to be within the reach of a great many Americans, particularly in the West. Farming was often less profitable than other occupations, but farmers did not follow economic motives entirely in their choice of occupation. They were torn between two conflicting goals: independence and self-sufficiency, on the one hand, and the desire to earn money by selling in the marketplace, on the other. Eventually, market capitalism would dominate, but those other agrarian values have persisted to the present day.

These conclusions are reached by a systematic look at the farm as an economic unit, starting with the costs of acquiring a farm and proceeding to dairying, crop yields, mechanization, the production of marketable surpluses, farm income, and profitability. The findings are too rich and varied

to more than touch on here. For example, census takers recorded crop production but not the number of acres planted to each crop. The authors have thus calculated crop yields by regression analysis and determined that average yields were well below the contemporary claims that historians often cite. This implies that productivity may have increased more than previously thought in the late nineteenth century. Surpluses of dairy products, meat, and grain were figured from estimates of production and consumption on the farm by both humans and animals. Both regions turned out to be commercially oriented and produced surpluses for market, but midwestern farmers had more to market than northeastern ones. Profitability was calculated by state, taking into account capital gains, the rental value of farm houses, labor costs, depreciation, home consumption of farm products, and other factors. Contrary to commonly held notions, northeastern farmers were found to be the most profitable, though midwesterners could expect greater land appreciation over the long run. The Pennsylvania rate of return was 10.1 percent for every dollar invested. Since this was below the northeastern average, one wonders what the result would have been had more of the state's richer agricultural counties been included.

In looking at rural society beyond the farm, Atack and Bateman discovered highly diversified local economies and a more even distribution of wealth than in the South or in later periods, although, as expected, wealth was correlated with "being middle-aged, white, male, educated, and native-born" (p. 101). Families migrated to places near the same latitude where they had lived before; fertility was higher in the Midwest than in the Northeast and highest of all among immigrant women.

The authors' methodology, which is painstakingly explained at every point, sometimes interferes with readability. On the other hand, they have been quite modest about their findings, qualifying them when in doubt and using the most conservative estimates when there were conflicting ones to choose from. Tables and charts illustrate nearly every point. *To Their Own Soil* adds significantly to our knowledge of antebellum northern agriculture, supplementing the more traditional approaches taken by Paul Gates and state historians like Stevenson W. Fletcher.

*Agricultural and Rural History Section*  
U.S. Department of Agriculture

DOUGLAS E. BOWERS

*The Panic of 1857 and the Coming of the Civil War.* By JAMES L. HUSTON.  
(Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1987.  
xviii, 315p. Tables, appendixes, bibliography, index. \$32.50.)

In this carefully researched monograph, James L. Huston argues that in the North economic issues figured in party realignment in the 1850s and

Republican success in 1860. The Panic of 1857 did not displace the anti-slavery and ethnocultural appeals of the Republicans, but it reinjected such issues as banking, the tariff, and the labor question into the political agenda. The economic issues, however, were framed within the terms of the ideological struggle between free and slave labor systems, giving that debate fresh saliency. Because southern Democrats blocked a higher tariff and free homesteads, the Republicans could cogently argue that there were pocket-book reasons why free labor would benefit from Republican victory. The panic's greatest impact, Huston shows, was in Pennsylvania, essential to Republican fortunes in 1860. Research in over 30 newspapers in that state, and nearly 100 nationwide, coupled with careful quantitative analysis of voting patterns which aimed to isolate the impact of the panic from other variables, suggest that while economic policy was not important elsewhere, it mattered in Pennsylvania because of that state's hard-hit coal and iron industries and the persistence of a strong nativist party which Republicans successfully wooed with appeals to economic nationalism. Huston faults the Democrats for not showing greater tactical flexibility by accommodating the rising protectionist tide in Pennsylvania, but he may underestimate the Democrats' room for maneuver, given southern sensitivity to protectionism and the South's grip on the party.

Elsewhere, too, the panic touched off labor unrest, owing to wage cuts and demands by the unemployed for relief. Republicans sensed an opportunity to broaden their base by adding protectionism and free homesteads to their free soil program. Huston aims to link politics to labor history, but his narrow focus on party realignment sometimes obscures the growing importance of the labor question. In New York City, for example, Democratic mayor Fernando Wood, in the face of bipartisan opposition, advocated direct relief for the distressed, a radical move towards defining the Democracy in incipient social-democratic terms. In New England the great strikes led by the Lynn shoemakers strained both parties, but especially the Republicans. Huston deserves credit for attempting to link labor and political history, but this theme needs further development.

Huston begins with a careful description of the causes of the panic according to contemporaries and modern analysts. Bank failures and the ensuing credit stringency were the immediate cause, but the underlying factor was contraction in demand for American exports. The panic revived older arguments over the banking system. Democrats dusted off their anti-bank rhetoric and regulatory policies, but these failed to revive party fortunes. The party was, as ever, deeply divided over banking; the Republicans offered no easy target because their divisions made vagueness the shrewdest course. Jacksonian banking nostrums seemed anachronistic in a maturing industrial economy, dependent on a modern financial system and ample credit. More-

over, the panic was short-lived. Finally, the struggle over the Lecompton Constitution in Kansas overwhelmed other issues.

Defenders of the South used the panic to press their argument that the slave economy was less vulnerable to hard times than the northern economy, while the southern social system was more stable, immune from the bread riots that marred New York City. Yet, while apologists justified slavery in patriarchal terms, Huston shrewdly notes, they also celebrated individualism, social mobility, and capitalism for white folks. "George Fitzhugh probably understood better than any other southerner the incompatibility between capitalism and slavery," he suggests (p. 91), but Fitzhugh was an oddball and not representative. Northerners, too, wrestled with contradictions, this time between the claimed superiority of a free labor system in a period of labor distress. "Tariffs, free land, and education was not the labor program the artisan wanted, but ultimately it was the one he got," Huston concludes (p. 109). Southern opposition to protection as a disguised expression of free soilism helped Republicans to fuse antislavery with their new economic program and use both as a defense of free labor. In these ways the Republicans seized upon the Panic of 1857 to demonstrate "the need to protect northern free labor society by appropriate federal enactments" (p. 231). Huston's argument gains weight because he does not press it too far, for he recognizes there were more important long-term sources of party realignment, such as sectionalism and ethnocultural divisions, yet the panic had a modest but measurable impact on Republican fortunes.

*University of California, Davis*

PAUL GOODMAN

*A House Divided: Sectionalism and Civil War, 1848-1865.* By RICHARD H. SEWELL. (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988. xii, 223p. Bibliographical essay, index. Cloth, \$29.50; paper, \$9.95.)

In his comprehensive history of the years 1847-1865, Allen Nevins filled eight sizeable volumes. Shelby Foote's examination of the Civil War is packaged in a bulky three-book set. The most recent history of the Civil War era, James McPherson's *Battle Cry of Freedom*, runs to over 800 pages. It is thus with a certain degree of skepticism that one approaches Richard Sewell's compressed account of sectional politics and the Civil War. How thorough can a scholar be, one wonders, when writing about one of the most turbulent periods in the past, both historically and historiographically, in less than 200 pages? Fortunately, a reading of *A House Divided* dispels

such suspicions, for Richard Sewell has produced a succinct, well-written overview of the causes and campaigns of the Civil War.

Sewell emphasizes national politics and policy decisions in the coming of the Civil War. As he puts it, he desires to "refocus attention on slavery as the taproot of sectional discord" (p. xi). Few readers will find this approach alarming. In assessing the origins of the war, Sewell rounds up the usual suspects: party politics, territorial acquisition, Kansas-Nebraska, Dred Scott, slave power and abolitionist conspiracies. He is especially attuned to matters of perception and is careful to emphasize that what often mattered most was what northerners and southerners "believed" to be true about their respective social systems.

Sewell's chapters on the war itself are especially well-crafted. He has managed to synthesize a vast subject and paint in broad strokes the outlines of a conflict that raged four years, took over 600,000 lives, and transformed American society. He has integrated the most recent social history into his narrative, focusing not only on the war from above (Lincoln, Davis, and their generals) but also on the war from below (the slaves who played an active role in forcing the issue of emancipation). In Sewell's telling, there was nothing inevitable about Union victory or the abolition of slavery. He does a fine job of showing how expectations shaped reality and events transformed expectations.

Without compromising the clarity of the narrative, Sewell might have fleshed out some of his material, especially in the chapters on the coming of the war. Economy, religion, and reform deserve more than the few paragraphs each topic receives. As in any synthesis intended for an undergraduate audience, Sewell at times oversimplifies his portrait of American society. The early republic was never only a "placid, basically agrarian world," and modern America is something more than an "urban, industrial, increasing atomistic" society (p. 1). The most frustrating aspect of *A House Divided* is that in a text brimming with illustrative quotations, endnotes are not provided.

These problems aside, Sewell has written a fine short history of sectionalism and Civil War that should fill a pedagogical need for those who teach survey courses but prefer assigning interpretive syntheses and primary sources instead of multi-volume textbooks.

*University of California, Riverside*

LOUIS P. MASUR

*Advance the Colors! Pennsylvania Civil War Battle Flags.* By RICHARD A. SAUERS. (Harrisburg: Capitol Preservation Committee, 1987. xvi, 304p. Illustrations, glossary, atlas, appendixes. \$45.00.)

Civil War soldiers regarded their state and national flags with a degree of reverence difficult to understand in this age of widespread public indif-

ference to patriotic symbols. The colors carried by infantry and artillery units and the standards borne by cavalry regiments not only stimulated morale and imparted a sense of corporate identity but helped ensure an outfit's survival. In the fire of battle, in times of crisis, rallying 'round the flag promoted unit cohesiveness and facilitated defensive efforts. Not surprisingly, the veterans came to view their shot-torn, bloodstained banners as sacred icons, mementoes of a time of unparalleled sacrifice and heroism.

No state sent more flags to war from 1861 to 1865 than Pennsylvania. Alone among northern states, the Commonwealth ensured that at least one state color (as well as replacement banners, as needed) went to each regiment and battery it raised for federal service. Bearing the red and white stripes of the national standard, these colors also carried the Pennsylvania coat of arms amid a forty-three-star canton, with the unit's designation lettered in gold along one of the stripes. The state banners were accorded a prominent place among each regiment's color guard, the nine-man contingent that also had custody of the national standard, the regimental color that many outfits carried, and the various other flags by which a unit identified itself.

Most of the flags that survived the conflict—many reduced to tattered cloth, minus staff, finial, and ferrule—were returned to Harrisburg by 1866. Given the rudimentary preservation practices of the era, they were permitted to deteriorate inside display cases at the State Armory, later in the South Executive Building, later still in the Executive Library and Museum Building, and after 1914 in the Capitol Rotunda. Not until the early 1980s did private efforts lead to the establishment of the Capitol Preservation Committee, an independent Commonwealth agency that launched a "Save-the-Flags" campaign. The Committee's objectives include not only a long-term restoration and preservation program but a project to document the historical background of each regimental banner in possession of the state. *Advance the Colors!*—the first of two volumes projected to cover Pennsylvania's 213 regiments and nine independent batteries—is an outgrowth of that project.

Volume I, which treats the flags of various prewar units as well as those of the first eighty-seven regiments mustered into Civil War service, is sumptuously done. More than 160 color photographs of state, national, and regimental flags, company guidons, and flank and general guide markers shine forth from high-quality paper stock. These are complemented by dozens of wartime illustrations depicting flags and flagbearers, as well as by a 238-page text by Richard A. Sauers that chronicles the service of each infantry, cavalry, and artillery unit, with emphasis on the role played by its colors. The text is comprehensive, well-written, and generally accurate, though occasionally marred by errors of fact and typography. Sauers's narrative benefits from extensive research among state, federal, and private archives. Brief but helpful bibliographies for each unit list not only standard

printed sources but also unpublished collections of soldiers' letters, diaries, and memoirs. Five maps depict areas of operations covered in the text, while two appendixes provide statistical data on each unit and define its regional composition.

An overview of state combat participation and a sometimes fascinating glimpse into the moral power that flags exerted on mid-nineteenth-century warfare, *Advance the Colors!* is equally pleasing to the historian's eye and palate. One can only look forward to the appearance of Volume II.

*Office of the Historian,  
Headquarters Strategic Air Command*

EDWARD G. LONGACRE

*Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919.* By NELL IRVIN PAINTER. (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1987. xliv, 402p. Index. \$25.00.)

*Standing at Armageddon* is the most important reinterpretation of the Populist-Progressive era to appear since the publication of Robert Wiebe's *Search for Order* some two decades ago. Indeed, it is the first work since then to provide a plausible framework for considering the years between 1877 and 1919 as a continuum rather than as an age of "agrarian radicalism" followed by a contrasting urban, middle-class "progressive era." While Wiebe located the reformist impulse in the drive of an emerging "new middle class" of bureaucrats, technicians, managers, intellectuals, and professionals seeking to impose their occupational systems and values upon an increasingly chaotic urban, industrial world, Painter ascribes the same role to the era's "dispossessed"—an amorphous "working class" of farmers, organized and unorganized industrial laborers, "new" immigrants, blacks and other racial minorities, and working women. The struggle, whether cast in socioeconomic or ethnocultural terms, was always between the "partisans of democracy and the protectors of hierarchy" and the stakes were, as they have always been, "the distribution of wealth and power" (p. xiii).

By organizing into farm-labor political parties proposing "radical" nostrums and into unions that made their demands through strikes and other forms of demonstration, the working class set much of the agenda for the Progressive era and raised the consciousness of the rest of society both to the plight of the dispossessed and to the possibility of a social revolution. Although acknowledging that middle- and upper middle-class motivations were frequently complex and ambiguous, Painter forthrightly assigns primacy to fear. At bottom, the more comfortable elements in society were energized to reform as the only feasible means to forestall a much more

drastic overhauling of the socioeconomic order that might be brought about by bloodshed and violence. This apprehension, Painter asserts, produced both the reforms that softened the injuries of class and the rationalizations of production that increased employers' control over workers, thus reconciling the apparent dichotomy between amelioration and social control. When such concessions failed to assuage working-class demands, this fear was translated into a brutal "red scare" that justified repression of radicals, organized and unorganized labor, and ethnic and racial minorities in one fell swoop.

As do all such pioneering efforts, Painter's work inevitably raises at least as many questions as it answers. Her focus on the "dispossessed" as the source of the reformist impulse certainly will not go unchallenged by the various proponents of middle- and upper-class interpretations of the era. Nor will her attribution of fear of social revolution as the critical motivating force that animated reformers. The strong focus on events at the national level after 1900 actually serves to weaken the author's arguments. The vast body of literature on municipal and state developments during the Progressive era is replete with examples of continuous working-class involvement and effectiveness. The representatives of agrarian and industrial labor were not content to stop at raising the consciousness of middle-class reformers; they elected people who represented their interests and who shaped legislation to meet their needs. The focus on national events also overstates the importance of World War I on the decline of the reformist impulse. In most cities and states it seemingly died at an earlier point, thus suggesting different views about causation. Studies of cities and states during the era of World War I and the Red Scare seem to be desperately needed.

Having said the above, it is obvious that Nell Painter, like her protagonists, has set historians an agenda to test her interpretations and to rethink their own. At best, *Standing at Armageddon* might rekindle the interest and enthusiasm of historians in the Populist-Progressive era, an interest that has been largely moribund, like reform itself, for nearly a decade.

*University of Wisconsin-Parkside*

JOHN D. BUENKER

*The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925.* By DAVID MONTGOMERY. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. xii, 494p. Index. \$27.95.)

This study focuses on the minority of workers between the Civil War and the 1920s whose workplace experience led them to become militantly committed to the democratic direction of the economy. Montgomery finds

diverse roots of this militancy: among craftsmen, for instance, in their codes of manly "ethnic" behavior that provoked them to efforts to regulate their industry collectively; and among common laborers, such as dockworkers, in their code of "enforcing the card" to exclude non-union workers, and textile operatives, in their propensity to resist reductions in piece rates. Both groups—craftsmen and common laborers—evinced in their "matrix of work, family, peer-group and neighborhood bonds . . . the breeding ground of class consciousness." According to Montgomery, the importance of these solidarities went beyond the workplace, challenging the prevailing ideology of acquisitive individualism with an alternative mutualism "rooted in working-class bondings and struggles."

Montgomery explains that labor militancy developed against a backdrop of crisis in capitalism, as a declining rate of profit fueled a massive business shakedown that left modern business enterprises in dominant control of major American industries. In alliance with professional groups, they sought to develop a new capitalist collectivism based on social engineering. The norm of industry became the employers' incessant reexamination and reorganization of work relations based on scientific management, with its emphasis on worker efficiency, and on personnel management, with its emphasis on worker loyalty.

These developments involved a broader ideological struggle over the direction of labor relations. Promoters of a new social settlement—most prominently the business, labor, professional, and community leaders of the National Civic Federation—advocated shifting the focus of labor relations from the division of the surplus to an increase of the surplus through cooperation. For conservative labor leaders, this involved supporting stable contractual relations and abandoning output restrictions and sympathy and wildcat strikes in return for such improvements as reduced working hours—what in essence Montgomery characterizes as substituting sacred national agreements for class solidarity as the mainspring of union strength.

Two developments undermined this approach: the labor surpluses of the depression of 1903-1904 encouraged an alternative business tactic of court cases against boycotts and sympathy strikes and community mobilization against unions; and conservative union leaders proved unable to control their progressive members sufficiently to avoid sympathy strikes and wildcats in defense of traditional work rules. Thereafter, Montgomery argues, the conservatives asserted their control of unions through bureaucratic and authoritarian control over the administrative machinery, alliances with religious movements (for example, the labor forward movement and the Catholic Militia of Christ, whose moral authority helped unions recruit members and enlist sympathetic public opinion while discrediting socialism), and closer cooperation with the Democratic party, particularly during World War I.

According to Montgomery, Samuel Gompers rammed through American Federation of Labor participation in the preparedness campaign and the war in order to secure the position of the trade union movement in a socially managed society. All the while, massive strikes continued to demonstrate that despite the diversity of the working class, there was unified opposition to the conservative settlement.

There is a dichotomy in the book, however, that appears unresolved at the end. On the one hand, Montgomery recognizes that the restructuring of capitalism had a different impact on different workers, creating a variety of ideologies represented by influential bodies of working people; Gompers presumably represented one of these, and arguably the most influential. On the other hand, by the end of the book Gompers and the conservatives in the movement do not emerge as representatives of anyone much beyond themselves, securing unqualified support through cooperation with Woodrow Wilson and wartime agencies and, in the post-war period by astute political manipulation within the AFL to undermine any chance of the reestablishment of the pre-war socialist coalition. The militancy that at the beginning of the book is recognizably a minority phenomenon is by the end a majority one, albeit a silent, or silenced, majority.

This aside, Montgomery's study is a tour de force, representing both the most sweeping synthesis to emerge from the "new labor history" and a deft melding of his own primary research. It is likely to stand as the standard reference point in the field for some time to come.

*George Meany Center for Labor Studies*

STUART KAUFMAN

*Less Than Forever: The Rise and Decline of Union Solidarity in Western Pennsylvania, 1914-1948.* By CARL I. MEYERHUBER, JR. (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1987. 235p. Bibliography, index. \$30.00.)

Carl Meyerhuber's *Less Than Forever* is a regional labor history of southwestern Pennsylvania, one of the most important areas of industrial America. The volume is more a collection of essays dealing with discrete episodes occurring in various locations than a tightly woven monograph. Four of the eight chapters focus on unionizing efforts by coal miners; two chapters treat steelworkers; and one chapter each examine electrical workers and aluminum workers. Another chapter is devoted to the strike activities of local constables, county sheriffs and their deputies, the state constabulary, and company security forces (including the infamous Pennsylvania Coal and Iron police). Several of the chapters cover region-wide topics, such as the activities of

the National Miners Union, while other chapters focus on local events, such as the organizing efforts of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers in the towns of Apollo and Vandergrift on opposite banks of the Kiskiminetas River. Unfortunately, the author and press elected not to include a detailed map of the region, which would have been of great value in enabling the reader to locate some of the more remote mill towns and coal patches mentioned.

*Less Than Forever* is at its richest when it focuses on the local scene and is slightly less insightful when it takes the broader view. Nonetheless, Meyerhuber is able to develop several significant themes throughout his study. The author clearly links the rise of industrial unionism in western Pennsylvania with the eroding of the regional economy, an ironic situation that set up preconditions to organized labor's eventual decline. Far more often than not, Meyerhuber points out that it was crises generated by the regional economy and not ideology that caused workers to take collective action. Neither socialism nor communism took firm root in the western Pennsylvania workers' value system. Rather, workers of the region were generally of a "conservative temper" and not particularly receptive to radicalism. The exact reasons for this conservatism are not clear, but it was influenced by ethnic and religious considerations, as well as a fear of black strikebreakers. Nor were workers extremely devoted to principles of union democracy, as revealed by the slight resistance they offered when their industrial unions evolved into vehicles for business unionism, red-baiting, and personal ambition. Above all, Meyerhuber convincingly argues that "the alleged power of Big Labor in the region was an illusion" (p. 10). Whatever successes the area's industrial unions enjoyed were fleeting. "Labor solidarity proved ephemeral, and disunity the rule" (p. 207). By the post-World War II era, the narrow job-conscious vision of the industrial unions, when combined with the erosion of their base by economic dislocations, resulted in the unions becoming marginal actors in the area's social and economic affairs. Meyerhuber illustrates well the decline of industrial unionism by recounting its exclusion from any significant role in planning the Pittsburgh Renaissance.

Meyerhuber's book will be of great interest to labor historians as well as those interested in Pennsylvania's past. Even though more remains to be done on working-class activities in the Pittsburgh region, *Less Than Forever* contributes much to the subject.

*Ohio State University*

WARREN R. VAN TINE

*Don't Call Me Boss: David L. Lawrence, Pittsburgh's Renaissance Mayor.* By MICHAEL P. WEBER. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988. xxii, 440p. Biographical sketches, appendixes, index. Cloth, \$32.95; paper, \$16.95.)

Michael P. Weber's biography of David L. Lawrence, political architect of the Pittsburgh Renaissance and one of the foremost urban leaders in post-World War II America, is a finely crafted work. Weber examines each stage of Lawrence's long career—his political apprenticeship in the law office of Allegheny County Democratic Chairman William J. Brennen, his own struggles as county chairman against the entrenched Republican organization, his support for Franklin D. Roosevelt and the ascent of the Democratic party in Pittsburgh, his success as Democratic party chairman in Pennsylvania and subsequent appointment as secretary of the commonwealth during the administration of Governor George Earle, his rise to the post of Democratic national committeeman, and his service as governor of Pennsylvania and chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity Housing. Lawrence's years in City Hall and his contributions to the Pittsburgh Renaissance, however, constitute the heart of the book.

Weber's deft use of interviews adds a distinctive richness to the work and affords numerous revealing insights into Lawrence's character. Devotion to the Democratic party and love for Pittsburgh permeated the politician's life. His meager formal education caused him to favor associates with lofty degrees. From Brennen, he learned formality and the value of political alliances. His early efforts to maintain a semblance of Democratic strength in the face of Republican superiority taught him pragmatism, the value of party unity, and the wisdom of compromise. Lawrence, nonetheless, was a man of principle who backed minority rights, opposed McCarthyism, and endorsed the nation of Israel.

The mayor's skills and traits were most evident in his support for the Pittsburgh Renaissance. He aggressively sought flood and smoke control, improved municipal services, and pushed for slum clearance. Lawrence also relied heavily on the dreams and technical expertise of Robert Moses, Wallace Richards of the Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association, Park Martin of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, and others to refurbish his city. Realizing the need for cooperation with the private sector, the mayor chaired the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh and forged successful alliances with Republicans Richard King Mellon and Arthur Van Buskirk. The result was a dramatic transformation in the quality of life and business in the Steel City.

Weber's biography is a favorable one, but the author does not overlook Lawrence's weaknesses. The police scandals and the improper use of city

workers receive ample treatment, as do the construction of the Civic Arena and the displacement of low-income residents during the Lawrence administration. Weber, however, presents these difficulties from the mayor's standpoint and is perhaps on occasion too generous with his explanations.

Interpretation, of course, is the prerogative of the author. Weber's work is a fine study of an able urban politico who rose through the ranks, had a generally positive impact on his city, and became an influential voice in the Democratic party on the state and national level. It is possibly the best biography of one of the so-called New Breed Mayors of the post-1945 era.

*Wright State University*

EDWARD F. HAAS

*Let This Life Speak: The Legacy of Henry Joel Cadbury.* By MARGARET HOPE BACON. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987. xvi, 253p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$27.50.)

Some well-known Quakers were subject to revelation, and a number have been given to extreme action, but not Henry Joel Cadbury (1883-1974). Co-religionists and fellow scholars such as Cadbury's brother-in-law Rufus Jones, and his associate Douglas Steere, might stress mysticism in the experience of Friends. But for Cadbury faith consisted largely in enduring "the Absence of God." Friends moved by deep convictions might disrupt services in "steeple houses," as had Quaker founder, George Fox, or commit civil disobedience like modern pacifist, A.J. Muste. But Henry Cadbury chose less demonstrative methods of witness.

He stood in vigils, performed volunteer humanitarian service, and marched for world order. At Harvard in the 1930s he held out for academic freedom against a state-imposed loyalty oath. But for the most part, Cadbury lived the life of a scholar. Even where he most excelled, he remained reticent and reserved. His research was precise. He avoided interpretative forays and provocative speculation.

The author of this biography is intrigued by the "echoes of a continued search and continuing longing" which she finds in Cadbury's writings and talks, and by severe depressions which he experienced. She stresses these traits enough to cause the reader to ponder them, but tends to be as chary of interpreting her observations as her subject was of interpreting his research.

Margaret Hope Bacon does note that Cadbury's relationship with his parents (particularly his mother) was a "paradigm of his relationship with the world of Philadelphia Quakerism. . . . When he brought the disapproval of the community upon himself he suffered, turning the anger inward." If this is the key to his character, we need a better understanding

of his formative years and of how they affected the one episode in his life when Henry Cadbury was not reticent.

During World War I, as an assistant professor at Haverford College, Cadbury sent an impassioned anti-war letter to the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*. Written on Haverford stationery, the letter evoked public criticism, created consternation among Friends, and resulted in his dismissal from the college. The experience heightened his respect for the "men and women whose prophetic voices had moved the Society [of Friends] forward . . . but who had suffered at the hands of the Society as a result." But he never again emulated their boldness.

In spite of, or perhaps because of, strong inner constraints, Cadbury cultivated a life of excellence in scholarship, teaching, and social service. In conveying the essence of these accomplishments Bacon's book is at its best.

Cadbury's research on the Book of Acts and the person of Luke were pathbreaking; his writings and lectures on the historical Jesus and the history of Quakerism were praised by scholars and welcomed by lay audiences. At Haverford, Andover-Newton, Harvard, Bryn Mawr, and Temple University, Cadbury was loved as an outstanding teacher.

It was fitting that in 1947 Henry Cadbury accepted the Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of the American Friends Service Committee. With Rufus Jones he had helped establish the Committee and was second only to Jones in guiding and sustaining its efforts to promote mercy, justice, and peace.

Cadbury's gifts included a keen sense of humor and a mischievous wit, which provided exactly the right counterpoint to the brashness of his wife, Lydia. Margaret Bacon gives us numerous glimpses of this non-conformist woman and assures us that the Cadburys' marriage was fulfilling. She implies that fatherhood was not Henry Cadbury's strongest suit but does not elaborate on this point.

Before closing Bacon's book, this reader contemplated the photograph on p. 190: Cadbury and A.J. Muste talking and smiling together. It was Muste's belief that "Joy and growth come from following our deepest impulses, however foolish they may seem to some, or dangerous, and even though the apparent outcome may be defeat." This was a point of view that Henry Joel Cadbury surely appreciated, but we are left to wonder about the inner forces that prevented him from pursuing it further.

*Morgan State University*

JO ANN O. ROBINSON

*Philadelphia Theatres, A-Z: A Comprehensive, Descriptive Record of 813 Theatres Constructed Since 1724.* By IRVIN R. GLAZER. (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986. xiii, 277p. Illustrations, glossary. \$45.00.)

Philadelphia's theatre history, as rich as that of any city in the nation, has been chronicled in the past, but no one has gone a step further and—as Irvin R. Glazer has—told the basic stories of the theatres themselves. In the past there has been some attention paid to the legitimate houses and the music halls—especially the Walnut, the Arch Street (Mrs. Drew's), the Musical Fund Hall, and the Academy of Music—but none of the writers have bothered to list the motion picture palaces and the smaller movie theatres that for decades dotted the city.

Glazer has separated the introductory history into five parts: from the coming of William Penn to the 1830s when the rise of Greek Revival architecture caused Gilbert Stuart to call the city “the Athens of America”; the Centennial city; the interim period when the variety houses rose in importance, the legitimate theatre was in its heyday, and the advent of the movies (which arrived earlier than the layman realizes); the inception of the movie palace era; and the present and future theatres. He includes *everything*: experimental theatres, sports arenas (the Spectrum), college and university auditoria (Irvine), avant-garde (the Theatre of the Living Arts), and even such places as Wanamaker's, which played host to many stars of stage and screen.

In his account of these various eras and the diversity of their theatres, he fills the story with anecdotes—Victor Herbert being “helped into the pit of the Earle Theatre, after too many back-stage toasts, to inaugurate the new theatre by conducting the orchestra,” the Benny Goodman concert at the same theatre in 1939 which prompted a reviewer to say a psychiatrist should write an appraisal of the event, the William Goldman suit against the film producers/distributors (which he won), or how the author removed Spanish tiles from the new Carman Theatre (originally they had been part of the Tunisian building at the Sesquicentennial Exposition in 1926). There is a good bit of small talk and gossip here which enlivens the telling of a rather factual story.

The strength of the book is the alphabetical listing of 813 Philadelphia theatres from the Southwark Theatre, which opened in 1766, to the Zellerbach in 1971. Location, capacity, the architects involved, and special features are included, and the author seems to have listed every possible house, even the recently expanded Ritz Five.

Future researchers will applaud him for industriously assembling all this detail between covers. Glazer, at one time a director and president of the Theatre Historical Society, also includes a section, entitled “Concentration of Theatres in the Original City,” with a map to indicate clearly their location and the sections of the city with the greatest density of theatres.

# JOHN NEAGLE

## PHILADELPHIA PORTRAIT PAINTER

*Written by Robert Wilson Torchia, guest curator*

**T**he first major study of John Neagle since 1925, this catalogue includes an extensive biography of the artist, entries on over thirty paintings from area collections, and individual essays on his two most famous portraits: *Henry Clay* and *Pat Lyon at the Forge*.

Born in Boston, John Neagle (1796-1865) became one of Philadelphia's foremost portrait painters. Robert Wilson Torchia explores the evolution of Neagle's style, his involvement in Philadelphia social and political life, and his scholarly approach to his profession using personal letters, notebooks, and diaries of the artist which heretofore have never been consulted for historical analysis.

This catalogue accompanies the exhibit at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, April 18, 1989-July 29, 1989.

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
THIRTEEN HUNDRED LOCUST STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107

He devotes another section to architects and the buildings themselves, with dates for the opening of each and for alterations to the original building. There also is a glossary of architectural and theatrical terms.

On the debit side, Glazer provides no index. This is a serious omission. It was probably left out because the theatres themselves and the architects are listed in their respective sections in alphabetical order, but no book of this magnitude should be without an index. It is unfortunate, too, that the book's typeface, reminiscent of the typewriter, compresses so much copy to a page that reading the book is not as felicitous as it would be had the type been better chosen.

Still, Glazer deserves congratulations for assembling such a vast amount of material between covers. The book is obviously a labor of love, and historians are in his debt for having compiled it.

*University of the Arts*

JOHN FRANCIS MARION

# THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Howard H. Lewis, *President*

## *Vice-Presidents*

Stanley Abelson

Margarett F. McKeel

*Secretary*, David W. Maxey

George W. Connell

S. Robert Teitelman

*Treasurer*, Wm. Richard Gordon

## *Councilors*

### *Term Ending 1989*

Gerald T. Brawner

Ragan Henry

Julia Leisenring

Carl L. Neilson

Russell F. Weigley

### *Term Ending 1990*

Carol S. Baldrige

Muriel Berman

Edward D. Griffith

Stanley N. Katz

Frank E. Reed

F. Joseph Stokes, Jr.

James A. Unruh

### *Term Ending 1991*

Drew G. Faust

Carol E. Hevner

Rosemary Laphen

Frank P. Louchheim

Charles W. Soltis

William G. Warden, III

Harrison M. Wright

Bertram L. O'Neill, *Emeritus*

Caroline Robbins, *Emerita*

William Webb, *Counsel*



*Director*, Peter J. Parker



*Founded* in 1824, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has long been a center of research in Pennsylvania and American history. It has accumulated an important historical collection, chiefly through contributions of family, political, and business manuscripts, as well as letters, diaries, newspapers, magazines, maps, prints, paintings, photographs, and rare books. Additional contributions of such a nature are urgently solicited for preservation by the Society where they may be consulted by scholars.

*Membership.* There are various classes of membership: individual, \$35.00; family/joint, \$50.00; patron, \$125; contributor, \$250; connoisseurs' circle, \$500; benefactor, \$1,000. Membership benefits include invitations to lectures and exhibit openings, receipt of the newsletter, *The Pennsylvania Correspondent*, and a subscription to *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (individual membership without publications and student memberships are also available). For additional membership information please call the Society, (215) 732-6201.

*Hours:* The Society is open to the public Wednesday, 1 p.m. to 9 p.m.; Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. For exhibition hours please call the above number.

## Common Houses in America's Small Towns

The Atlantic Seaboard to the Mississippi Valley

*John A. Jakle, Robert W. Bastian, and Douglas K. Meyer*

Based on an inventory of 17,000 houses in twenty sample towns, this book dramatically extends discussion of housing types and cultural diffusion into the 1980s. Describing the settlement history and housing patterns of each town—including Millersburg, Pennsylvania—the authors introduce a comprehensive categorization that reveals the variation of housing type and characteristics across cultural regions of the eastern United States.

*121 photographs, 77 line drawings, and 82 maps and charts \$50.00*



## Spellbound

Growing Up in God's Country

*David McKain*

Set in the 1950s between the steep slopes of the Allegheny Mountains, David McKain's memoir of growing up in "God's Country" captures the harsh beauty of a Pennsylvania oil town and of a family coiled up in threads of poverty and tenderness, faith and affliction.

"Exquisitely written. . . . McKain reconstructs his past in unrelenting and vivid detail"—*Kirkus Reviews*

"*Spellbound* is at once a portrait of an ineluctably distinct childhood and a case study in a kind of curdled decency and haunted cheer whose provenance extends far beyond the confines of McKean County, Pa."—*Voice Literary Supplement*. \$18.95

*Winner of the Associated Writing Programs Award for Creative Nonfiction*

## Major Butler's Legacy

Five Generations of a Slaveholding Family

*Malcolm Bell, Jr.*

Set against the background of vast plantation holdings in the South and family homes in Philadelphia, *Major Butler's Legacy* encompasses American history from the eve of the Revolution to the first decades of our own century.

"A truly remarkable book"—*Civil War History*.

"A significant study of one family and, through it, of the Rice Coast of the Old South"—*Journal of American History*.

*Illustrated \$29.95 A Selection of the History Book Club*

## The University of Georgia Press

Athens, Georgia 30602