

temporary England. The only reason, in his opinion, that the North had escaped the worst consequences of its "agrarian, communistic, free-love, anarchical and leveling doctrines" was the safety valve of Western land. But "free society was a failure"; the natural condition of man, white or black, was servitude to capital, appetite, and the whip; liberty was a fraud, democracy a fiction, the class struggle a result of wage slavery. Only by alliance with the South could "Northern Conservatism . . . turn back the tide of Radicalism and Agrarianism," and he pleaded tactlessly for the factory-owner and slaveholder to stand together.

In this searching biography of a mind, for Fitzhugh lived only in what he thought, Dr. Wish of De Paul University has rescued a great American Tory from the oblivion of his own writings. He has added an important chapter to the history of American conservative thought, so much less known than our liberal and radical traditions. Thanks to the author, no one can read his book without seeing its relation to the struggle between liberty and authority in the present century. This reader would question only one statement: "Lincoln's own Virginia heritage explains in part his sympathetic attitude to certain contentions of the South" (p. 156). And if more could be asked of a reflective book, which even those who dislike the abstract will find exciting, for my part it would be a more thorough exploration of the European sources of Fitzhugh's ideas. The transit of ideas across the Atlantic is the kind of immigration which Americans are prone to overlook or else to feel strongly about without much comprehension.

Roger W. Shugg

Ohio in the Twentieth Century, 1900-1938. Planned and compiled by Harlow Lindley. Volume VI, *The History of the State of Ohio*, edited by Carl F. Wittke. (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1942, pp. xiii, 563. \$25.00 per set.)

This volume is a cooperative and topical treatment of Ohio history in the twentieth century. As such it differs from the other volumes which are coordinated accounts by individual authors. In it fifteen authors treat sixteen topics in seventeen chapters. It exhibits the virtues and the defects of cooperative writing. The chapters are written by

experts in the respective fields and are brief but thorough monographic treatments. Governmental developments are described by a political scientist, agriculture by a rural economist, and banking by an economist. But there are also instances of repetition, overlapping, omissions, and differences as to methods, style, and point of view in the various chapters. For example, relief and educational finance are discussed under government in the second chapter and under "depression activities" in the sixteenth; some of the chapters are formed out of lists of names sandwiched between short statements of facts, while others are well written and thoroughly digested historical accounts. The progressive character of the first fifteen years of the twentieth century is not adequately pictured at any point. Another topic that is not adequately treated is the history of sports.

The volume illustrates not only the merits and defects of cooperative endeavor but the inability of some experts to write history. Social history must be a digested historical treatment and not a list of authors or printers or other persons and their works which are deserving of mention. Such facts become as dull as a list of battles and generals or of political campaigns and their participants.

Had the committee been able to find a trained historian who had specialized in the recent field, a more adequately coordinated history could have been produced. The merits of his work would depend in part upon his ability to gain enough technical information about the various specialized subjects to have written not only a coordinated account, but one based upon an adequate understanding of a complicated era of specialization. An historian of such broad training is not always available and the present volume represents one solution of a difficult problem.

Probably too much has been said by way of unfavorable criticism. The work has many merits. It carries the history of Ohio to as recent a point as 1938; it exhibits very little prejudice or bias; it is not characterized by excessive state pride but rather by a proper degree of modesty. Most of the chapters are very well done. When one considers the difficulties of writing recent history, the conclusion must be that the authors and editors have been quite skillful and successful.

John D. Barnhart