
This study is an example of history as the detailed and uninterpreted reporting of past politics. Professor Warner's book on the Ohio progressives is a vast source book of political fact, unadulterated by interpretation but by no means devoid of value judgments. The book lacks the conceptual framework necessary to give meaning and perspective to the material presented. The only framework offered, actually a value judgment based on uncritical admiration of the progressives and their goals, is demonstrated by such chapter titles as "Victory for Progress." In his obvious disgust for the boss system and his panegyrics on the leaders of "reform," Warner is performing the function of a latter-day muckraker in a time when serious students of the progressive era are taking a deeper look at the functional relationships between the various political, social, economic, and ethnic groups in the society.

More serious is the lack of distinction between ideology and practice. Warner accepts, for example, the progressives' own statements that the effect of city-wide nonpartisan elections was to give the "people" more responsive government, when recent studies have shown that this was not necessarily the practical effect, or even the intended effect. The possible significance of the fact that the heaviest voting on the successful 1912 Constitution came in Columbus from the "conservative, well-to-do wards" is missed, and it is not even noted whether this voting was in favor of or against the changes offered! Warner almost never discusses the ethnic, religious, and other patterns of voting and gives the impression that the public was aware of all items of the state platforms and voted strictly according to ideology. The notion that local issues may have been as important or even more important determining factors in voting behavior is not broached and certainly not explored in depth. Thus, the author is unable to explain why the capricious voters sometimes rejected reform and sometimes approved it.

At times, one believes that the basic issues will be dealt with, as, when in the Preface, Warner suggests that he will test the Hofstadter thesis with respect to Ohio (this was obviously not part of his original plan since the dissertation upon which the book is based was done years before Richard Hofstadter advanced his status-revolution concept) but, in fact, does not do so in any clear way. Some topics are
dealt with quite well, for example, the chapter on tax reform in which the interest groups and conflicts are well outlined. The last chapter on "The End of an Era" is undoubtedly the best written from a literary standpoint, primarily because it has about one-fifth as many facts and details, proportionally, as the other chapters. The bibliography is complete; Warner consulted every possible manuscript source. In short, no one can accuse him of doing a slipshod or hasty job. The very thoroughness which might have been a strong point has, however, created a ponderous encyclopedia and chronicle of the progressive era in Ohio.

The author has created a source book for other scholars, but not a book which will fascinate the general public. The style, though dry, is clear and forthright. The documentation is very complete, and the scholar will find the footnotes very helpful. The author, however, would have done well to look closely at his own evidence. He shows, for example, how efficient and responsive to constituents was boss George B. Cox's machine in Cincinnati, but fails to say so in clear terms. Warner cannot believe, apparently, that anyone could prefer efficiency and responsiveness to "morality," and he never quite understands why Cox kept coming back between reform waves.
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This is the twentieth in a series of fifty handbooks designed to make easy the study of local history in the United States. Like the previous issues, it is the work of an expert, an accredited authority. It was written with a frank enthusiasm but without any pretense of formalism. Reading it is a pleasure, not a task. Dr. Stevens, the author, is a popularizer. Clifford L. Lord of Hofstra University introduces his production with the challenge: "Do you enjoy a good mystery story? . . . The possibilities are unlimited. Have fun."

But that colloquial invitation does not close the door to serious scholarship. Dr. Stevens himself is an example of what happens to