Pennsylvania Politics, 1860–1863. By Stanton Ling Davis, assistant professor of history, Case School of Applied Science. (Cleveland, The Bookstore, Western Reserve University, 1935. ix, 334 p.)

This doctoral dissertation is evidently designed to fill gaps in the monograph literature on the Civil War and the history of Pennsylvania. In his preface the author harps on the often plucked string that laments the neglect of Pennsylvania history—"There is no adequate synthesis of the general history of Pennsylvania... although the political history of most of the more important northern states during the period of the Civil War has been studied in detail, for some reason the story of the internal politics of what in some respects was the most important of all the northern states has been overlooked."

In six chapters the author sketches the background of Civil War politics in Pennsylvania and describes the campaign of 1860, the attitude of Pennsylvania toward secession and the effects of the attack on Fort Sumter, the election of 1861 and its consequences, the reaction of Pennsylvanians to the Emancipation Proclamation and the arbitrary policies of the Lincoln administration, and the reelection of Governor Curtin in 1863. The work is for the most part old-style political history in a rather narrow sense, but probably most students of history will agree that it is a story that wanted to be told. Woven into the narrative are the complex evolutions, organizations, and controversies of political parties in the state; the activities of political leaders; the varied reactions to the slavery question and the tariff; the Pennsylvania Railroad and the tonnage tax; the Union leagues; and the personal, sectional, and economic motives and compromises. It is all done with admirable objectivity, with perhaps a slight degree of sympathy for the "under dog." The influence of the protectionist motive, especially in western Pennsylvania, in turning the state from its traditional Democracy is emphasized. The equilibrium of parties is clearly set forth. The opposition to the Democratic party hardly appeared officially as the Republican party throughout the war; in order to draw in the Know-Nothings, Whigs, and War Democrats such party titles as Union, Peoples, National Union, and four or five other designations were used. The Breckinridge and the Douglas Democrats found it difficult to work together, as did the Cameron and the Curtin factions of the opposition. The election of 1861 was practically a draw, that of 1862 was "the first clear cut Democratic victory in Pennsylvania for five years"
(p. 264), and that of 1863 the Republicans (under their various names) won by a narrow margin. Curtin was reelected by a majority of 15,335 out of a total vote of 523,679 (the largest vote ever polled up to that time); the Democrats were in the minority by one in the state Senate and by two in the House.

Western Pennsylvania receives a good share of attention. The Pittsburgh Gazette and Post are cited many times. The former is described (p. 322) as "a Republican paper in the narrowest sense of the term...a high tariff organ and violently abolitionist," opposed to compromise and in favor of "a little letting of blood...a staunch supporter of Cameron" and hostile to Curtin. The Post is described (p. 323) as "the leading Democratic paper of the state throughout the Civil War," favorable to compromise, but after Sumter a supporter of a vigorous war policy to crush rebellion. Allegheny County appears in the strange role of a hotbed of radicalism, where there was the bitterest hostility to corporations, especially the Pennsylvania Railroad: the county commissioners went to jail for contempt of court rather than fulfill their contractual obligations to the railroad. The author found himself forced to depend largely on newspapers as sources. He regrets the scarcity of personal papers of such political figures as Simon Cameron, Andrew G. Curtin, and the like. Some points might have been illuminated by reference to the Covode Papers in the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania. The reviewer believes that it is an indication of the indispensable character of Alexander K. McClure's Old Time Notes of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1905), when an author cites it more than 140 times in one book.

This and that could no doubt be said in criticism of the selection of materials, of the placing of emphasis, and of the interpretation of men and events, and there are several errors in spelling, typography, and technique; but the story is well told and the work generally well done.

A word must be added concerning the method of printing this book. The volume contains an introductory statement by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Materials for Research of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council; these organizations apparently played a part in the publication of the work, but the fact is not explicitly stated. The substance of the statement is a plea for the use of some inexpensive method of reproduction of the products of historical research valuable to scholars but not likely to appeal to a wide reading public. The method used in this case is the new "liquid process" hectograph. The edition is quite limited and designed mainly for deposit in libraries. There is an intimation of a later edition that

Twenty years after the damming back of "the immigrant tide" by the World War and more than ten years after the restriction of immigration by quota legislation, serious attention is being directed toward problems of internal migration in the United States. With colorful maps and careful marshaling of the all too meager store of available statistics, Mr. Thorthwaite and Miss Slentz have traced the flow of population from state to state since 1850 and the net gains and losses of certain counties and cities during the last decade. Their report is part of the study of population redistribution in which the Social Science Research Council, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the University of Pennsylvania are participating, "a reconnaissance study... in the hope of discovering bases for the determination of public policy." The study is directed by Professor Carter Goodrich of Columbia University.

Except in Oklahoma, where the authors found annual school census data useful, the study is limited to ten-year comparisons based on the federal census data. There is no information on total migration; only the net displacement of persons from their respective states of birth can be determined. From 1900 to 1930 Pennsylvania exhibits a net loss of white persons born in the state in contrast to the net gains shown by New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Ohio. Only part of the loss was offset by a gain of negroes and foreign-born migrants. The losses were heaviest in the rural parts of the state; the counties around Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Erie profited by migration in the decade from 1920 to 1930, as in earlier years. In contrast to net gains, from 1920 to 1930, of 1,200,000 in Los Angeles County, 500,000 in Wayne County (Detroit) and 150,000 in Cuyahoga County (Cleveland), Allegheny County attracted and retained only 57,000 more migrants than it lost. Beaver County gained 20,000, but Washington County lost 13,000 and Westmoreland County 26,000 persons in the exchange of populations.