

ample, he effectively substantiates his contention that the rejection of reconstruction policies in the South corresponded to the rejection and dismantling of the overblown governmental apparatus the Civil War had created in the North. Thus the nation's retreat to its more comforting and accustomed laissez-faire traditions in the 1880s and 1890s can be seen as a reaction to the governmental intrusiveness of the 1860s and 1870s. These years also saw a rising interest in the use of government at all levels for the regulation and ordering of social and economic forces. Keller suggests that a major reason for the development of this apparent contradiction to the prevailing limited-government orthodoxy was simply that the tremendous growth the nation experienced in every area created new complexities and strains that demanded political and judicial solutions. The public responses to these problems in the late nineteenth century established a basis for the progressive reforms which were proposed and adopted after 1900.

The wealth of detail presented, however, tends to overshadow the consideration of such major themes because all topics are covered with the same degree of thoroughness. The uniformity of emphasis is deliberate as Professor Keller intends to cover the whole range of public life, not just its more striking aspects. Nevertheless, some of the subjects discussed cry out for far more exposition than they receive; others seem negligible or worthy of only passing notice. The book as a whole, then, is like a smorgasbord which provides the consumer with a melange of nibbles and intriguing tastes but leaves him essentially unsatisfied. Fortunately, two excellent features help offset the shortcomings which this approach necessarily creates. First, the book is well written with a flowing, easily comprehensible style which traps the readers' interest and encourages him to persevere. Second, it is heavily and instructively referenced, with the notes where they should be at the foot of each page. Those interested in further details about any of the topics touched upon have readily at hand a number of avenues to pursue.

—**John M. Dobson**
Iowa State University

The Indiana Voter: The Historical Dynamics of Party Allegiance in the 1870s, by Melvyn Hammarberg, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977. pp. 251. \$17.50.

As the "new political history" continues to develop, both its promises and its perils become more evident. The increasing methodological and conceptual sophistication of recent studies enrich us as they uncover previously hidden facets of the American political experience. At the same time, however, they threaten to widen further the gulf between professional historians and the reading public, and to divide the profession into two groups—those who write traditional, essentially narrative, political history, and those who eschew description for analysis.

By concentrating on analysis rather than description, Melvyn Hammarberg, associate professor of American Civilization at the University of Pennsylvania, adds considerably to our understanding of the Indiana electorate of the 1870s. By comparing his findings with those of other recent analyses of late nineteenth-century midwestern politics, especially those of Paul Kleppner (*The Cross of Culture: A Social Analysis of Midwestern Politics, 1850-1900*, 1970) and Richard J. Jensen (*The Winning of the Midwest: Social and Political Conflict, 1888-1896*, 1971), he not only illuminates the political process in Indiana, but also describes a midwestern political environment more complex than that uncovered by Jensen and Kleppner, who emphasized the close relationship between partisan affiliation and voting behavior, on the one hand, and ethnoreligious, i.e., national and religious, factors, on the other hand.

Without denying the relationship between either nativity and voting behavior or religion and voting behavior, Hammarberg demonstrates that, at least in Indiana in the 1870s, the ethnoreligious interpretation of voting behavior associated with Jensen and Kleppner is less satisfactory than many historians have assumed in the last decade. Hammarberg utilized additional types of data, a more sophisticated analytical technique, and political science theory to investigate the "historical dynamics of party allegiance during the 1870s." *The People's Guide: A Business, Political and Religious Directory* (1874) and the 1870 manuscript census supplied biographical data about 1,216 men of voting age in nine central Indiana counties. This allowed him to go beyond such recent studies as those of Jensen and Kleppner, by analyzing the relationship between political party affiliation on the one hand, and such variables as occupation, wealth, place of residence, religious affiliation, and place of birth, on the other hand, for individuals rather than for such aggregates as the townships, precincts, and counties used in other recent studies.

Using individual as well as county level data, and the more sophisticated analytical methods, as well as the theories of political scientists, Hammarberg found patterns of party allegiance and of voting behavior more complex than those described by ethnoculturalists. Although church membership patterns corresponded with party preferences in central Indiana in the 1870s, they explained less about the state's politics than earlier studies in the new political history had suggested. Utilizing the conclusions of political scientists that ". . . party allegiance is itself a means by which the electorate is structured, having its own dynamics quite apart from those induced by social, economic, religious, or other popular groupings . . .," (p. 11) Hammarberg demonstrates that such political affiliation is, in many cases, an independent variable.

He also shows that place of residence was an independent variable, with central Indiana farmers considerably less Republican than townsmen living in the same county. While three of every four townsmen, who identified with a political party, were Republicans, only half of the farmers indicating a party preference identified with the GOP.

Indiana farmers and townsmen also differed in the extent to which the

members of each group identified with either of the major parties. While most men in the *People's Guide* counties identified with the two major political organizations, a few indicated a preference for a third party, and a larger minority said they had no party preference. The latter group, whom Hammarberg calls Independents, were considerably more numerous among farmers than among townsmen.

Place of residence, however, explained only some of the variation in the levels of Republican affiliation among Indiana men in the 1870s. Partisan preference also corresponded with social status, as large landowners and self-employed townsmen both identified more closely with the GOP than their less prestigious neighbors.

While many historians, including this reviewer, welcome Hammarberg's study as a valuable addition to the new political history, many other professional historians, and the great majority of lay devotees of *Clio*, will undoubtedly find the work less appealing. The explanation can be found in Richard Jensen's description of *The Indiana Voter*: "Hammarberg has written a pure social science history with no humanistic aspect whatever . . . Hammarberg uses only numbers for primary evidence." Lest this brief quotation be misinterpreted, let it be noted that Jensen intended this passage as a description, not as a criticism, of Hammarberg, and that Jensen's review of the book is quite favorable.

Some idea of the extent to which Hammarberg's volume differs from the types of traditional political history found in the *Annals* and most other state historical journals can be seen in the seventy-six tables and thirty-one figures which appear in the 180 pages of text and the three appendices. (The *Annals* has published one example of the new political history, "Ethnicity in the 1940 Presidential Election in Iowa: A Quantitative Approach," 43 (*Spring*, 1977), 615-635. Despite its date of publication, this article represents an example of the early stages of quantitative political history, and shares little with the Hammarberg volume other than its use of "only numbers for primary evidence.")

A brief analysis of Hammarberg's index also reveals the unconventional nature of the study. Only thirty-eight names of people appear there. Fewer than half (seventeen) were participants in the subject of the study, the politics of the 1870s. The majority (twenty-one) are other historians and political scientists, whose work Hammarberg discusses and, in the case of several of the political scientists, uses in his analysis of Indiana voting behavior in the 1870s. The small number of names of the political actors of the 1870s is one result of the new political (and the new social and the new economic) historians' interest in mass (grass roots) behavior rather than in the activities of the more visible members of the society they study.

Hammarberg's volume may also discourage some potential readers because so much of the study is devoted to lengthy descriptions of his methodology, e.g., pp. 55-61, 143-166, while other passages will discourage many readers because the author uses so much specialized language (jargon?), e.g., pp. 42-45, 64-75, 110. This is unfortunate, because those who read this

study will learn much about Indiana politics in the 1870s, and, by extension, will undoubtedly also learn much about midwestern politics in that decade.

One answer to the problem of creating and writing social science history, while at the same time making it attractive to the largest possible audience, may be found in the format used by Robert William Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman in their monumental work *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* (1974). Fogel and Engerman solved much of the problem by publishing their results in two volumes—a volume of readable prose which described their conclusions, and a second volume, *Time on the Cross: Evidence and Methods—A Supplement*, whose subtitle indicates its contents. While such a two-volume format may not be economically feasible for all social science history monographs, perhaps a more clear-cut division of single-volume works into two sections would be helpful. The first section could state the principal findings in everyday prose, while a second section contained the quantitative data, a description of the methods employed, and a discussion of the problems encountered. Such a format for Hammarberg's study would undoubtedly increase the number of persons who would read his principal findings, without denying to other readers the opportunity to study his data, to learn his methods, and to share his consideration of the problems faced in conducting the investigation.

Because Hammarberg's volume adds significantly to our understanding of late nineteenth-century midwestern political life, going beyond such earlier examples of the new political history as those of Jensen and Kleppner, it deserves the widest possible audience. To secure that audience, new historians, be they economic, political, or social historians, should devote themselves to the task of presenting their findings in the most attractive form possible, as well as to the task of applying social science methods and insights to their analysis of human experience. If Hammarberg and other social science historians develop as much skill in presenting their findings as they do in their search for understanding, the new history may help bridge, or at least narrow, the gulf which now exists between social science historians and others, and thereby secure the largest possible audience for the promising work of the new history.

—Thomas G. Ryan
University of Northern Iowa

Better City Government: Innovation in American Urban Politics, 1850-1937, by Kenneth Fox. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977. pp. xxi, 222. \$15.00.

Kenneth Fox, visiting Assistant Professor of History at the State University of New York, Binghamton, has written a thoroughly researched account of urban political theory and urban politics during the crucial years from 1850 to 1937. Trained by Thomas C. Cochran and Seymour Mandel-

Copyright of Annals of Iowa is the property of State of Iowa, by & through the State Historical Society of Iowa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.