

University of Birmingham Historical Journal. Edited by Philip Styles. (Birmingham, England, Kendal, Titus Wilson and Son, Ltd., 1947, 10s. 6d. annually.)

The publication of this new historical journal by the University of Birmingham is a most noteworthy event and should have cultural repercussions both in the United States and England. The *Historical Journal* has been established to provide an outlet for the historical researches of "past and present members of the University," and its first issue is not only a tribute to the editors but also to the historical scholarship of Birmingham. The scope of this annual is not limited to any particular period or aspect of history, but editorial policy requires that one article in each number deal with the local history of the Midlands. The plan of the editors is to publish historical documents from time to time, but new book publications will not be reviewed.

This first volume more than carries out the intentions of the editors. One article deals with Roman history, one with English medieval history, one with Bohemian history in the days of Hus, another with the history of a Midland municipal corporation during the period of the later Stuarts, one with the population growth of the city of Birmingham between the two World Wars, and last but not least one treats historiographically the imperial problem in North America in the eighteenth century. The selection is varied. The scholarship first class. The tastes of most English and American historians should be gratified.

Margaret Galway's treatment of the relationship of Joan of Kent to the establishment of the Order of the Garter is an especially fine piece of work. Well-written and ably organized, the article presents an excellent example of the use of internal criticism to scrape away the historical muck that has surrounded the Maid of Kent. It is a story of intrigues, danger, love, and pathos wherein the author concludes that Joan "was more sinned against than sinning" (p. 50).

The revaluation of Jerome of Prague by R. A. Betts, Masaryk Professor of Central European History at the University of London, adds to the historical knowledge of Hus's great follower. Betts attributes the lack of information on Jerome to the fact that he was a man of action rather than words, but he is of the opinion that Jerome was at least equal to Hus in learning. It is a study that any periodical dealing

with the history of central Europe would be most happy to publish.

Local history is apt to have an extremely limited appeal, but Philip Styles has written the history of Bewdley in such a way that it is of interest to all students of English history, especially those who are primarily concerned with the period of the later Stuarts. Bewdley, a town on the Severn, mirrors the national scene. The workings of the Clarendon Code in this borough corporation assumes additional significance because of the association of Richard Baxter with the town. In addition, the reader is given a local study of those religious and political problems which "became canalized into clearly recognizable Whig and Tory parties during the next thirty years" (p. 107).

The most important contribution and the one which will be of most interest to American historians is the analysis by the late Sir Charles Grant Robertson of the imperial problem in North America in the eighteenth century. The years of study which made Robertson one of the more able scholars of the eighteenth century reach their culmination in this historiographical essay. This is indeed a masterful treatment of the revision in interpretation of the American Revolution from George Bancroft to J. C. Miller, wherein Robertson carefully weighs the imperial problem and the changing British and American attitudes towards it.

Of the American historians who have written on this subject, George L. Beer, Charles H. McIlwain, Herbert L. Osgood, and Charles M. Andrews are considered to be the best with Andrews leading all, "to whose range of learning, scholarship, and sobriety of judgment, adequate justice has not been done in Great Britain" (p. 137). It is too bad, however, that the works of Lawrence H. Gipson were ignored. Of interest to Americans will be the statement: "It must also be confessed that the American contribution in solidity of knowledge and determination to set out the truth impartially is demonstrably superior to the British" (p. 137). Robertson was too modest about his own impartiality and learning, and this bit of historiography should be required reading for all graduate students working in American colonial history or eighteenth century British history.

The University of Birmingham and the editor-contributor Philip Styles are to be congratulated for the fine be-

ginning that they have made with the *Historical Journal*. Books treating the history of the Midlands might be reviewed. Notwithstanding, historical scholars will undoubtedly await expectantly the next appearance of this well-printed historical annual.

Indiana University

John J. Murray

Indiana, An Interpretation. By John Bartlow Martin. (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1947, pp. xii, 300, xvii. Index and illustrations. \$4.00.)

"Haven't you heard that there are only forty-five states left in the Union? Kentucky and Tennessee have gone to Indiana, and Indiana has gone to hell." This little joke, which author Martin incorporates in his volume, is not exactly representative of his work, but it does indicate something of its character. It is not a lovely book. It administers a shock treatment or, like Jove, hurls a bolt of lightning at the people of Indiana. The author strives to awaken Hoosiers to the revolutionary changes which the Industrial Revolution has brought, and to the existence of large masses of relatively uneducated people who are not qualified to decide problems of world importance and who can be whipped into a frenzied racial intolerance. Gone, as characteristics of the state, according to the author, are the neighborliness of the small town, the virtues of pioneer days, the democracy of the common man, in short, the Hoosier tradition. Perhaps, Hoosiers need to be awakened to the industrial character of their state. In this day of postwar reconstruction, they should be reminded of the disgraceful story of intolerance and hate which was written in the state after the previous world war. The critical treatment of local capitalists and labor leaders may also have advantages.

After the virtues of the shock or of the bolt of lightning are exhausted, the inadequacy of the book becomes very apparent. The author is not Jove. His work is not a "sound" interpretation of Indiana as the publishers claim. Lacking is an evaluation of the good features of the state.

The author devotes very little space to the period before the Civil War, but enough to reveal that it means little to him and that he should have begun his work in 1860 or later. There is also little relationship of individual chapters to the