

tion on the tariff, which probably alienated some of his longtime backers. After the election, Dallas was miffed, perhaps justifiably, when Polk named Buchanan as secretary of state and awarded Pennsylvania patronage to Wheatland's sage. Buchanan had finally won the power struggle.

After serving as vice-president (a position Dallas occupied with traditional invisibility), he did not return to public service again until 1856. In that year he accepted an appointment as minister to England. His aristocratic nature was appreciated, and he made a perfect diplomat. In May 1861, Dallas returned to the United States, dying in Philadelphia in December 1864.

In many ways, the career of George M. Dallas typified the American public servant of the nineteenth century. He regarded politics as a game. Only when an issue arose, affecting his personal political base, did Dallas find himself on the losing side of a national argument. He was an aristocrat first, and a politician second — a distant second. In sum, one finds it hard to disagree with the author, who writes, "no amount of effort could convert Dallas into an authentic Jacksonian."

George M. Dallas was not an exciting or colorful individual, and in accurately portraying his subject, the author has produced a competent but unexciting book. Dallas may have regarded politics a patrician obligation, and the author admits he encountered a lack of personal papers dealing with the things in life that really mattered to Dallas — family, wealth, station, and culture. The publisher deserves a word of criticism for not providing illustrative material for this book. In spite of these minor criticisms, *George Mifflin Dallas: Jacksonian Patrician* stands as a valuable, scholarly contribution to national history.

Arizona and the West
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

GERALD THOMPSON

Reckoning with Slavery: A Critical Study in the Quantitative History of American Negro Slavery. By PAUL A. DAVID, HERBERT G. GUTMAN, RICHARD SUTCH, PETER TEMIN, and GAVIN WRIGHT. With an Introduction by Kenneth M. Stampp. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976. Pp. 398. Authors' preface, introduction, appendixes, bibliographical references, index. \$4.50.)

It is not often that a history written by university professors and

based on complicated statistical programming receives the attention of Robert Fogel's and Stanley Engerman's 1974 work, *Time on the Cross*. Upon publication, this book was immediately reviewed in *Time*, *Newsweek*, and almost every major popular magazine. Newspaper reviewers all over the country followed suit, and the *Reader's Digest's* resident popular historian quickly composed an article utilizing material from the book. The reaction was almost totally favorable and went something like this: historians, using the ultimate weapon, the computer, had definitively "proved" that, after all, slavery really had not been all that bad. Slave masters had not whipped slaves very often; they had not attacked black women much; they took good physical care of their charges; and, as good businessmen, they recognized the economic value of their slaves and carefully inculcated the work ethic in them. The slaves accepted these ideas and became more productive than free white workers in the North.

These arguments and others in the same vein, couched as they were in seemingly unassailable computer-based statistics, made a tremendous impact on the American public. Few were the practicing historians who were not told by students and neighbors that *Time on the Cross* had opened their eyes to the true facts about slavery. If any further proof was needed, all one had to do was read the section where the authors attacked earlier historians of slavery, especially Kenneth Stampp, as being "neo-abolitionists." The history of black people in bondage, the public believed, had been accurately told for the first time. Throw away all the earlier books, the truth had been promulgated.

As professional historians began to publish their reviews, doubts about the definitive nature of *Time on the Cross* began to surface. Herbert Gutman composed a review which filled an entire issue of the *Journal of Negro History*, and this review has since been published in paperback book form. Several university symposia were held to discuss the book's topic. Practicing historians quickly indicated basic disagreements with the book's thesis.

Still, the book seemed to withstand these first attacks. Supporters rebutted that conventional historians were attacking *Time on the Cross* because they either did not understand its computer-based arguments or because they refused to accept any quantitative history. *Time on the Cross* could not be dismissed that easily; quantitative history seems to possess a certainty that conventional history cannot match. Numbers would have to be refuted with other numbers.

To deal with this problem, several historians and economists,

skilled in the area of quantitative history, combined their efforts to investigate *Time on the Cross* on its own computer grounds. The result of their efforts is *Reckoning with Slavery*. Thoroughly, at times minutely, they dissected the book. They investigated its approaches, rechecked its numbers, looked at the same sources, and, utilizing the ground rules set down by Fogel and Engerman, sought to determine the validity of its arguments. Their unanimous conclusion is that: "The book embraces errors of mathematics, disregards standard principles of statistical inference, mis-cites sources, takes quotations out of context, distorts the views and findings of other historians and economists, and relies upon dubious and largely unexplicated models. . . ." "When the faults are corrected and the evidence is re-examined," the authors continue, "every striking assertion made in *Time on the Cross* is cast in doubt. The effect in many instances is to restore and reinforce more orthodox conclusions hitherto shared by conventional and quantitatively oriented students of the peculiar institution" (pp. 339-40).

To discuss even in outline the arguments used in *Reckoning with Slavery* to expose the fundamental deficiency of *Time on the Cross* would be impossible in a review such as this. Perhaps, however, a discussion of one of the most sensational aspects would be instructive. Fogel and Engerman utilize the diary of a Louisiana planter to indicate that, on this plantation, there were "an average of 0.7 whippings per hand per year" and then they generalize from this one plantation to the entire South. Herbert Gutman and Richard Sutch, who wrote the section in *Reckoning with Slavery* which attacks this conclusion, point out significant errors. They indicate that Fogel and Engerman miscounted the number of whippings actually administered on this plantation: there were 175 not 160. They also show that Fogel and Engerman overestimated the number of slaves: there were not about 120, there were actually between 59 and 71. The correct average, therefore, was 1.19 whippings per year per slave, not the 0.7 given in *Time on the Cross*.

Even more significant than these basic numerical errors is the Fogel and Engerman interpretation of them. Gutman and Sutch argue that these whipping statistics, rather than proving that whipping was not a major source of punishment, indicate just the opposite. These figures mean that "'on average,' a slave was whipped every four days. . . . A male was whipped every six days, and a female once every 12 days" (p. 59). With a whipping taking place every four days almost always in full view of the entire plantation slave

population, Gutman and Sutch ask whether the *Time on the Cross* figures prove the leniency of the slave master or do they indicate that the lash was an ever-present threat to the slaves?

Reckoning with Slavery is a thorough book which, using Fogel's and Engerman's ground rules, shows convincingly that *Time on the Cross* is a seriously flawed book. If Fogel and Engerman were lesser-known historians and this was their first book, such a total rejection of it and such disclosure of slipshod scholarship and tailoring of facts to fit a thesis would severely damage their reputations and their careers. Since they are veteran published historians holding positions at prestigious universities, we shall see. Hopefully, *Reckoning with Slavery* will undo the misinformation promulgated to the public by *Time on the Cross*. Otherwise the impact of the latter will be long felt in the public mind.

Department of History
Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, Mississippi

JOHN F. MARZALEK

The Indiana Story, 1875-1975: Pennsylvania's First State University.

By JOHN EDWARD MERRYMAN. (Clearfield, Pennsylvania: Kurtz Bros. Printers and Lithographers, 1976. Pp. xii, 458. Preface, illustrations, appendixes, endnotes, bibliography, index. \$8.95.)

Histories of colleges, universities, and school districts are usually a mixture of nostalgia containing lists of teachers, principals, and photos of buildings and champion athletic teams and are usually self-serving. Such works have limited value in telling the historical and philosophical development of the institution. *The Indiana Story, 1875-1975*, by John Edward Merryman is for the most part a refreshingly different story of Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Professor Merryman brings to his task the skills of a trained historian and educator. The scholarly character of his study is manifested by the extensive use of footnotes and the wide range of sources. The author shows a considerable knowledge of the history of Indiana County and of the educational philosophy of the people in Pennsylvania and the county in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The first two chapters deal with the historical, educational, and philosophical setting in the state and in Indiana County which led up to the establishment of a school for the training of public school