NEHA News
The Newsletter of the New England Historical Association

VOLUME XV, No. 1 SPRING ISSUE APRIL 1988

NEW HAVEN MEETING
ANNUAL ELECTIONS
NEHA BOOK AWARD

Annual elections were held at the conference at Albertus Magnus College last October. Roger Howell, Jr. (Bowdoin) was elected Association president, Barbara Solow (Harvard) vice president, and Mary Wickwire (University of Massachusetts, Amherst) secretary. Jack Larkin (Old Sturbridge Village) and Karen Kupperman (University of Connecticut) were elected to the executive committee and Fred Cazel (University of Connecticut) and Borden Painter (Trinity) were elected to the nominating committee.

The NEHA book award for 1987 was awarded to Alex Keyssar for Out of Work: The First Century of Unemployment in Massachusetts, published by Cambridge University Press. Professor Keyssar received his undergraduate and graduate degrees at Harvard; his essay, Melville's Israel Potter, won the LeBaron Russell Briggs prize in English and was published by Harvard Press in 1969. He has been an assistant professor at MIT and Brandeis and moved to Duke as associate professor in 1987.

The fall sessions were well-attended. Abstracts of the papers appear, as usual, in this issue. The plenary session was devoted to a review by three leading authorities of the contributions to history of Lawrence Stone. Because of the unusual nature of such a session, we have printed the papers, and Professor Stone's response to them, in greater detail than usual, to the point of increasing the size of the newsletter. It was thought that members, especially those who were unable to attend, would appreciate a permanent record of the occasion.

SECOND CALL
SPRING MEETING: April 23, 1988
SALEM STATE COLLEGE
SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS

Salem State College will host the annual spring meeting of NEHA on April 23, in Salem. The revised program is included in this issue; preregistration and luncheon reservation forms have been mailed to the membership. Directions to the Salem State campus and a representative list of local motels were included in the previous mailing.

Vice President Roger Howell, Jr. has arranged the program and Professor Mary Emily Miller has been in charge of local arrangements, at the campus and the Boston Yacht Club. We are very grateful to Professors Howell and Miller and to our colleagues at Salem State for their efforts on our behalf.

There will, as usual, be two morning sessions with three meetings each. The subject of the afternoon plenary session, "The Uses of History at the End of the Twentieth Century", is one of interest and relevance to all members.

The centerpiece of the luncheon meeting at the Boston Yacht Club will be the presidential address by NEHA President Paul A. Fideler. The topic of President Fideler's address is "History and Political Theory." Members are urged to attend the luncheon and address as this event is one of the highlights of the Association's year.

Proposals for papers or sessions for the fall meeting at the University of Hartford or the spring 1989 meeting at Lowell State Park may still be sent to Vice-President-elect Barbara Solow, at the W.E.B. DuBois Institute, Canaday Hall-B, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138; (617) 495-4192.

REVISED PROGRAM

SPRING MEETING — APRIL 23, 1988 — SALEM STATE COLLEGE

THE NEW ENGLAND HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

8:15-9:00 REGISTRATION — ALUMNI HOUSE LOBBY

9:00 SESSIONS

1. GENDER AND REFORM IN ANTEBELLUM NEW ENGLAND
[Salem Room]
Chair: Karen Halttunen, Northwestern University
"Propriety in Female Antislavery Petitioning: Ambiguities of Citizenship in the American Republic, 1834-1860" Deborah Van Broekhoven, Ohio Wesleyan University
"Gender Roles and Labor Activism in New England during the Antebellum Period" Teresa Murphy, University of Rhode Island
Comment: John Brooke, Tufts University

2. ART AND IDEOLOGY
[President's Hall]
"The Image of Jews in the Art of the Middle Ages"
Robert Michael, Southeastern Massachusetts University
"The Ideology of Work in William Morris and the Arts and Crafts Movement" Larry Lutchmansingh, Bowdoin College
Comment: Thomas W. Puryear, Southeastern Massachusetts University

3. HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
[Lynn Room]
"Namier and the Mind of Politics" Robert Patterson, Castleton State College
"Toward a New View of the House of Lords: A Review of Current Research" Michael W. McCahill, Brooks School
Comment: Franklin W. Wickwire, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

10:30 INTERMISSION

10:45 SESSIONS

4. THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION
[Salem Room]
"The English Monarchical Succession and the Accession of William and Mary" Howard Nenner, Smith College
"Looking Back on 1688" Stephen Baxter, University of North Carolina
Comment: Timothy Harris, Brown University

5. AUSTRIA IN ITALY, 1848-1866: A REAPPRAISAL
[Lynn Room]
Chair: Emiliana P. Noether, University of Connecticut, Storrs
"Enlightened Despotism and State Building: The Case of Austrian Lombardy" Alexander Grab, University of Maine, Orono
"Austria as Policeman: The Politics of Public Order in Central Italy, 1831-1848" Steven Hughes, Loyola College, Baltimore
"Italians in the Austrian Armed Forces, 1848-1866" Lawrence Sondhaus, University of Indianapolis
Comment: Alan Reinerman, Boston College

6. DOCTORS AND MEDICINE IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE
[President's Hall]
"Hydropathy, Enlightenment, Profit, and Iniquity at the Waters of Spa in the Eighteenth Century" Bland Addison, Jr. Worcester Polytechnic Institute
"Pommes, Pills and Purgatives: Medical Guides to Healthy Living in Renaissance Germany" Paul Russell, Anna Maria College
Comment: Joanne H. Phillips, Tufts University

12:30-1:15 RECEPTION [Boston Yacht Club]

1:15-2:45 LUNCHEON — BOSTON YACHT CLUB

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS — PAUL A. FIDELER — LESLEY COLLEGE
"HISTORY AND POLITICAL THEORY"

2:45 PLENARY SESSION
[Boston Yacht Club]

"THE USES OF HISTORY AT THE END OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY"
Discussants: Theodore H. Von Laue, Clark University
Mary Johnson, "Facing History and Ourselves", Brookline, Massachusetts
Douglas Little, Clark University
Comment: The Audience

NEWS OF PROFESSION

The W.E.B. DuBois Institute for Afro-American Research and the Charles Warren Center in American History at Harvard University are holding a research conference on "Slavery and the Rise of the Atlantic System" at Harvard University, September 8, 1988, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. The conference will address the contribution of slavery in transforming the Atlantic into a complex trading area uniting North and South America, Europe, Africa, and the Caribbean through movements of men and women, goods and capital. It will bring together scholars representing every area of this network to consider how their areas mutually interacted in the slave era to produce the Atlantic system. Contact: Randall K. Burkett, Associate Director, W.E.B. DuBois Institute, Canaday Hall - B, Harvard university, Cambridge, MA, 02138. (617) 495-4192.

There will be a lecture and dinner on the occasion of Fred Cazel's retirement this spring from the University of Connecticut, Storrs. On Wednesday, 27 April, Giles Constable will speak on "Past and Present in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Perceptions of Time and Change" at 4:00 p.m. in Gentry Auditorium on the campus. A reception and dinner by reservation will follow. Contact: Judy Abbott, (203) 486-3783.

The New Hampshire Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History announces the founding of the Calender of History Events, a quarterly publication which will list upcoming seminars, meetings, exhibits, and events to the interest of New Hampshirites. For further information, or to list events, contact Brian Nelson Burford, editor, NHCCPH Calendar, P.O. Box 192, Antrim, NH, 03440-0192.

The Rhode Island College Foundation announces the establishment of the Ridgway F. Shinn, Jr. Study Abroad Fund. The fund will mark the retirement of Ridge Shinn from 29 years of teaching and service to Rhode Island College, where he was Professor of History, first Chairman of the Department of History, first Dean of Arts and Sciences, and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Throughout his career, Ridge regularly encouraged foreign study as a significant stimulus to the intellectual growth and development of undergraduates. It is anticipated that the first awards will be made in spring of 1990.

A former president and executive secretary of NEHA, Ridge is currently a member of the Association's executive committee.

The American Committee to Promote Studies of the History of the Habsburg Monarchy has recently been reorganized under the leadership of Karl Roider of Louisiana State University. The committee will begin publishing a newsletter in the fall of 1988 and solicits contributions of news items and names of persons who might be interested in joining the group. Subscriptions to the newsletter are free at present and may be obtained by writing Professor Karl Roider, Department of History, LSU, Baton Rouge, LA 70803.

The Department of History of New Hampshire and the International Conference Group on Portugal announce the availability of an Assistantship/Fellowship in Portuguese History, M.A. Level, beginning 1 September 1988. For further information, contact Professor Douglas L. Wheeler, Department of History, HSSC 408, UNH, Durham, NH 03824; (603) 862-3018.

Radcliffe College announces a

program of honorary visiting appointments for scholars at the Schlesinger Library. This program is intended for visiting faculty from other colleges and universities and for unaffiliated scholars actively pursuing research. There are no stipends or other funds associated with these positions, but Visiting Scholars will be provided with offices and will have library privileges at Radcliffe and Harvard. There will be up to five one-year appointments. The deadline for applications for 1988-1989 is 15 April 1988. Contact: Visiting Scholar Program, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College, 10 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138.

The University of Connecticut, Storrs, has received a $368,762 NEH grant to develop a national model for improving high school history classes and restoring the liberal arts to college curriculums. Through summer institutes and special lectures, college and high school teachers will examine the roots of Western civilization in the classical world and early modern Europe. Marvin R. Cox and Lawrence N. Langer of the history department received the award. The grant runs from January 1988 to September 1990.

AT THE SESSIONS

TEACHING HISTORY IN CHINA

Kenneth F. Lewalski, "In The Best of Times". I was a Visiting Professor at the Beijing Foreign Studies University in the Fall semester 1986, when China was singularly confident and optimistic about its modernization program, politically and ideologically tranquil, openly responsive to visiting educators, and receptive to pedagogical innovation. I taught one course in Modern History, [Enlightenment, English, American and French Revolutions, Early 19th C. Industrialization, Modernization and Social Reform] in a newly created graduate-level Cross Cultural Communications Program. The students were highly selective, intensely competitive, enviously bright, completely proficient in English language and writing skills. I was impressed with their factual knowledge of American history and their familiarity with basic documents. Their preparation in English and European history was weak. The principle purpose of my appointment was to enlarge and strengthen this component of the Cross Cultural program. The major problem I encountered was inadequate library holdings, especially in European history. The decentralized library system made student access to the library holdings, as well as the numerous books I brought with me, irregular and haphazard. Pedagogically, the students were accustomed to factual and informational lectures, reticent to raise questions or discuss the materials. As the term progressed, they responded positively to analytic and comparative methods and applied them successfully in term papers and examinations. I also gave a series of seven public lectures to the resident faculty on recent trends in American and European historiography [Annales, social history, Psychohistory, Women's and Minority history].

Bruce M. Stave, "Far From the Crabgrass Frontier...". An initial ambivalence to spend a year in China was transformed into enthusiasm for the experience, particularly since I found colleagues and students much more open than anticipated. I had been

warned that students would be passive, but this proved much less so than expected. While they had little trouble with the American history survey that I taught, it became clear that the teaching of American urban history in China was more difficult. This became quite clear when a student assigned the translation of an article on American suburbanization, Kenneth Jackson's The Crabgrass Frontier", appeared a week after the assignment to inquire about the strange term, "Crabgrass". Concepts, terms, and models dealing with the American city didn't always translate easily to Chinese. During the visit, I was able to conduct oral history interviews with Chinese architects, planners, and academics about Chinese urbanization and also carry out a study of oral history in China. My experience of teaching and learning in the PRC revealed many similarities between our societies, but as a historian, I was also impressed by the cultural differences regarding individualism, privacy, and mobility that separate the U.S. and China.

BREACHING THE BASTIONS

C. Dallett Hemphill, "Manners for Democrats...". This paper compared conduct advice writers' general pronouncements on class relations with their specific recommendations for proper face-to-face behavior. It rested on the theory that rules for face-to-face interaction have the ritual function (described by anthropologists and sociologists) of enacting the larger social order within individual interactions. I argued that the concrete suggestions for such interaction reveal more about true attitudes and expectations than do the more abstract assertions.

This approach illustrates the transition in America from an etiquette system designed by and for the elite, with advice to the middling and lower sort intended to reinforce elite control, to a code written by and for the middle class, with no discernable separate upper-class code. The first system was intended to enforce inequality in seventeenth century America, a time when wealth disparities were relatively small; the second to cloak the conflict between democratic ideals and the reality of increasing wealth stratification in the nineteenth century. While antebellum middle-class manners disseminators did not offer dramatically new forms (in many instances they adopted the old offerings of aristocrats), they assisted in transforming the nature and function of manners in America by suggesting that gentility could be self-taught in a democracy. On the other hand, while destroying the old courtly hegemony over etiquette, the middle class used it to erect an unspoken barrier between their own kind and "the vulgar sort". Thus, in early "Victorian" America, the middle-class made manners, and manners helped to make the middle class.

Howard M. Wach, "The Uneasy Life of Absalom Watkin...". " The "Manchester Man", long a stock figure in historical imagery, has most often been viewed as either Marxist villain or Whiggish hero. While embodying partial truths, these historicist conceptions reduce the industrial middle class to economic and political agents. Middle-class life included cultural aspirations, and these were considerably more ambivalent.

Absalom Watkin, a Manchester cotton merchant with impeccable liberal credentials, illustrates the cultural tensions which beset a social class coming to terms with its identity. In the decade after Waterloo, Watkin belonged to a 'Literary and Scientific Club' in which he and his friends gathered for both relaxation and intellectual 'improvement'. His

private recollections of the Club described science-minded auto-didacts struggling to learn chemistry. Watkin also wrote a series of newspaper pieces describing his Club, and in these public utterances he employed a quite different cultural language. Polished, urbane, sophisticated, and worldly, he deliberately invoked the genteel, aristocratic life of metropolitan gentlemen. The ancien regime lived on in this Manchester man's vision of the cultured life.

NEW ENGLAND AND THE CONSTITUTION

Anthony Limanni, "Anti-Federalism in Maine...". Long overlooked in the struggle for ratification of the Federal Constitution in Massachusetts is the role played by the District of Maine. As the ratifying convention was about to convene at Boston in early January 1786, Henry Knox wrote George Washington that there were three factions in the debate: commercial interests, insurgents, and those in the District of Maine. Knox believed that the issue of statehood for the District would be the determining factor in its stand on the Constitution. Statehood was certainly a motivating force in the contest, but it was neither the sole nor the most important factor in the debate.

The division between the coastal, commercial interests and the agricultural interior, which was the overriding issue in Massachusetts proper, was also the primary concern of the people of Maine. The same geographic pattern that characterized the town vote in Massachusetts fit the Maine vote as well. It is an incontrovertible fact that the more affluent communities overwhelmingly supported the new Constitution while the economically-depressed towns were opposed to it---both in the district and in Massachusetts proper. Anti-federalist activity in the District was thus of vital concern to the Federalists in their efforts to secure ratification. This is readily apparent in that the narrow Federalist victory in Massachusetts---187 to 168---could have been seriously undermined by any radical shift in Maine's forty-six votes.

TEACHING ABOUT VIETNAM

Peter Frost, "Problems of Perspective". In keeping with the Penel's emphasis upon the teaching of the Vietnam War to undergraduates I described the assumptions behind the History 322f Vietnam course currently offered at Williams College. That course begins by analyzing the debate between Frances Fitzgerald and her critics over the sources of power of the Vietnamese Communist Party and the National Liberation Front. It goes on to analyze the scholarly debates over why the United States became involved, whether the US adopted the most effective counter-insurgency struggle, and whether the Nixon-Kissinger peace plan was a reasonable one. The course concludes by discussing why the withdrawal of US troops in 1973 has not led to peace in the area. It thus explained the issues involved in these various debates, while also arguing that the rich materials and high student interest in the Vietnam conflict provide an ideal medium to discuss key questions of historical 'proof' and 'objectivity'.

DOING LOCAL HISTORY

Karen O. Kupperman, Why Do Local History?". In answering the question, why do research in local history? I drew on my current project, the English puritan colony on Providence Island. This West Indian plantation, settled at the same time as Massachusetts by equally committed puritans, developed totally differently from the New England colonies. Therefore, intensive

analysis of the circumstances, growth, and problems of Providence Island offers the opportunity to gauge the extent to which puritanism was responsible for the special social and economic structure of Massachusetts Bay. Put most simply, the question is: would the New England founders have erected the same kind of close-knit community life based on widespread land ownership if they had landed in a region suited to plantation agriculture? The experience of Providence Island suggests that the answer should be 'No'. Only local history, in-depth study of one or a series of ventures or cases, can begin to answer such important questions.

Ethan Tolman, "Comments". Local history should be taught, at all levels, for the following reasons: 1) it interests ill-prepared students through a change of focus. 2) Local history allows the historical process to become immediately relevant to students' own lives. 3) It is accessible. 4) It provides an excellent way to involve students directly with abstract concepts. 5) Local history can address process concerns without the distortion of overemphasis on factual matter of overriding importance. 6) Social history is obtainable in no other context.

LIFE AND WARFARE IN 13TH CENTURY CASTILE

James F. Powers, "Crime and Punishment...". One can gain important insights into the value system of a society by the manner in which it punishes crime. The question of personal honor and the strong sense of community obligation on an exposed military frontier were two major influences on the code of justice in Hispania during the Central Middle Ages. While the approach to fining individuals can be explored on the basis of evidence from all of the four major Christian states (Portugal, Leon-Castile, Navareer and Aragon) a fuller statement of municipal crimes and their respective punishments was available only in the great charter families of Coria, Cima-Coa and Cuence-Teruel. These can be supplemented on the national level by the great thirteenth-century codes of the Especulo and the Siete Partidas, although this law was not specific to towns. The major classes of punishment were fining, exile, loss of property, mutilation and death. The deeds of misconduct which provoked these sanctions tell us a good deal regarding the military pressures weighing upon the municipal militias, as well as the nature of their societal structure, which levied punishment according to social class. Since possessions as well as persons could be mutilated, it tells us as well about their strong sense of personal honor.

PLENARY SESSION

William A. Hunt, "Lawrence Stone and the Crisis of Aristocracy". Lawrence Stone's The Crisis of the Aristocracy is a book of such richness and complexity that it is virtually impossible to say anything about it, or about its subject, that isn't already contained somewhere within it, if only as an aside, or a qualification. I want to insist, however, that Crisis is more than a "monument of scholarship". It remains a living, provocative text.

Like Christopher Hill's, Society and Puritanism Stone's Crisis contains a worthwhile thesis topic in virtually every paragraph. Despite his valiant and exemplary defense of quantitative methodology, however,most of these topics will not be statistical in nature. Stone's great book has taken us about as far as we can go in

statistically charting the fortunes of the aristocracy as a class--- though there is obviously much work still to be done on individual families.

What has been established now that the dust has settled? First, that there was a marked levelling of the pyramid of landed wealth between roughly 1540 and 1640, and a reduction of the wealth and power of magnates relative to an expanded class of lesser aristocrats, known as the gentry. In that sense, the much contested "rise of the gentry" was a fact. It is also clear that economic changes put some aristocrats in a severe jam around the turn of the century. Financial difficulties, in combination with the obsolescence of their traditional military function, forced a transformation of their culture. This cultural re-orientation disrupted the aristocracy's traditional legitimacy vis-a-vis the lower orders. The magnates of England had to change from feudal chieftains to parliamentary patrons of the Whig era. The process was accelerated by what Stone brilliantly labelled the "inflation of honors"---the debasement of aristocratic titles by sale under James and the Duke of Buckingham.

There is a lot more work to be done on the consequences of these developments. Stone was quite properly concerned with the origins of the mid-century revolution, which led to the temporary abolition not only of monarchy but of the hereditary House of Lords as well. But it is by no means obvious that the social changes he has established should have proves at all conducive to such an outcome. There is thus a kind of logical hiatus, which some of his critics have rightly pointed out, between the facts Stone has established and the events he wishes to explain.

The decline of aristocratic military power and the expansion of royal administration led elsewhere to the tying of the aristocracy, great and small, to the expanding state machinery, and to the emasculation of the nobles as an independent political force, a process we might call Tocquevillization, from the classic analysis of The Old Regime and the French Revolution. By contrast, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth experienced a social evolution precisely opposite to that described by Stone for England. In Poland it was the great nobles who profited at the expense of both the Crown and the lesser gentry. Outside England, in other words, magnates appear as the enemies rather than the allies of absolutism---their "crisis" in England could logically have strengthened rather than weakened the Stuart monarchy. So why did the English crown fail to tame its aristocracy (great and small), into a docile, subservient service nobility, as happened elsewhere?

There were embryonic efforts in this direction. There were proposals for aristocratic academies, and for the creation of new orders of nobility requiring annual payments, like the french paulette. One of the things that got the Elizabethan earl of Essex in trouble---his unauthorized creation of hordes of knights during his military campaigns in Ireland---can be seen as a gesture in this direction, an abortive attempt to restore the meaning of knighthood as a reward for military service. The effort was abortive, one might argue, only because it was made by a declining favorite and repudiated by his sovereign.

The catastrophe of the Stuart monarchy will not be explained by statistics---Stone's or anyone else's---on aristocratic fortunes. The Crown needed to play the card of nationalism and imperialism, enlisting the aristocracy in a Protestant crusade against Habsburg power. Only some sort of imperialist enterprise could have furnished a persuasive pretext for

overriding the aristocracy's stranglehold on royal finance. The English crown desperately needed some functional equivalent of the French wars of religion to impose itself as the indispensible guarantor of national integrity. Instead, the Crown allowed itself to become implicated with the great threat to national identity, which most English gentlemen conceived to come from the Church of Rome and the Habsburg empire.

Aristocratic leadership in the opposition to the Crown requires us to qualify somewhat Stone's assertion that the Jacobean aristocracy suffered a generalized loss of prestige. It seems evident that the ideal of aristocracy retained immense force throughout the early Stuart age. It was against the ideal of protestant chivalry that the crypto-papists, and the toadies and venal parvenues promoted by James and Buckingham, were judged and despised. This ideal retained its hold even on Oliver Cromwell, who believed to the end of his days in a social order based on the hierarchy of noblemen, gentlemen, and yeomen: hence his attempt near the end of his life to restore a titled peerage by creating the Other House.

We should cease to consider the aristocracy en bloc, as a horizontally defined stratum, and focus instead on its cultural as well as economic divisions, and on the vertical coalitions which depended from these divisions, avoiding the dangers of personification, as in the Marxist tradition, where social classes are treated as hypostatized subjects. Treating a group as a subject has its uses, to the extent that the group shares a distinctive mentality, s set of perceptions and purposes. But it can be argued that Stone's "aristocracy" was far less of a clearly demarcated cultural entity than many continental nobilities. The greater gentry, whom Stone includes with the peerage in his definition of aristocracy, were not marked off from the middling gentry by any clear social or mental boundaries.

There was non noble status in England that distinguished whole families of nobles from the subordinate population. Thanks to primogeniture, there was a constant trickle of younger sons from the peerage and greater gentry into the lower ranks of the gentry, or out of it altogether. This trickle created ties of kinship across the lines of nobility and gentility, and presumably maintained channels of communication between aristocrats and their poorer cousins, thereby creating some community of perception between gentlemen and commoner.

For this reason I think it is time to break with the prosopographical model, and with the whole idea of Class as Subject. I think we have talked enough, for a while, about the fate of the Aristocracy as a Whole. Stone has convinced me, in fact, that there was no such beast as the Aristocracy as a Whole. We need, instead, to devote more attention to the "Puritan" coalition that linked great aristocrats like Warwick and Essex (and before them, Leicester and the elder, Elizabethan, Essex) to godly gentry, parish elites, and rank-and-file "professors". We need also to analyze the more diffuse coalition produced by reaction against the Puritan campaign for domestic reform and Protestant imperialism---a loose de facto alliance of high churchmen, crypto-papists, Hispanophiles, and simple conservatives.

As a concluding aside: Stone's later work has demonstrated that downward mobility out of the aristocracy has been considerably more important in England than the very limited degree of upward mobility into it. This finding, if sustained by further research, would entertainingly turn on its head the old argument about the survival of the aristocracy.

We had been told that the English aristocracy survived because it was so easy for wealthy bourgeois to climb into. The facts seem quite the opposite: it survived because it was hard for the bourgeois to climb into, and easy for younger sons to fall out of. Since there was little chance for anyone to break into the charmed circle, there was less frustration at the failure to do so, and less resentment of those who had been born within it.

This has very piquant implications for the whole question of mobility and ressentiment. We only resent people who receive what we imagine ourselves to have a right to, and which others like ourselves seem to be getting. Academic invidia is more likely to be kindled by a colleague's MacArthur Fellowship than by the award of the Heisman trophy.

David Underdown, "Lawrence Stone and the English Revolution". Lawrence Stone has often expressed his contempt for "antiquarian fact-grubbing", and for the "sterile triviality" of what it has tried to pass off as historical research. As all three of the papers this afternoon remind us, he has always been willing to take risks, and construct his own conceptual frameworks of major historical problems. Stone's style of history is an engagement with the big picture, the broad sweeping theme.

And what bigger theme than the English Revolution, the central event of seventeenth century English history? The audacious attempt to summarize the causes of this great upheaval was characteristic of Stone---though uncharacteristically for him he chose to do it in a mere 150 pages. In the case of Causes of the English Revolution, brevity does not mean lacking in importance. Stone's Causes was published in 1972, and it brilliantly synthesized the work of a whole historical generation. It was a generation nurtured, as Stone himself had been, by the magisterial figure of R.H. Tawney. Because of Tawney's influence, the traditional concentration of English historians on politics and the constitution was replaced after World War II by the search for sources of broader historical change. The rise of the gentry and the decline (or was it simply the crisis?) of the aristocracy became the keys unlocking the otherwise puzzling turmoil of the 17th century. By the 1960s, Charles I and John Pym could no longer be understood primarily through their ideologies, but were seen in Harringtonian terms---as products of a change in the balance of prpoerty-ownership whose roots lay far back at the start of the period we came to know as "Tawney's Century".

Causes is a marvelous synthesis, packed with provocative ideas and insights. Stone's wide range and breathtaking self-confidence in generalization allowed him to weave together social, intellectual, and more strictly political-constitutional factors in a way that nearly always compelled admiration and consent. Great events, like the English Revolution, he believes, have great underlying causes: it will not due to explain the civil war by constructing a narrative beginning in Scotland in 1637, or at Westminster with the meeting of the Long Parliament in 1640. We must look at the structures---the social changes that led to the rise of the gentry; the crisis of confidence that undermined the central institutions of government, the aristocracy, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy; the growing appeal of ideologies subversive of the monarchical authority (notably Puritanism and the myth of the Ancient Constitution); and the crown's failure to respond to these developments by creating more efficient military, administrative, and fiscal mechanisms.

Even in 1972 there were some features of the book which troubled some readers, myself included. The three parts, or chapters, were not altogether satisfactorily integrated---the result, obviously, of their having been originally composed separately, for different purposes. Some of us found parts of Stone's political narrative somewhat old-fashioned. He had taken over the traditional Whig narrative of events derived from Gardiner (and modified by Notestein's "Winning of the Initiative" thesis), and grafted it onto the social explanation that he, Tawney and others had developed. In good Whig fashion, he exaggerated the sharpness of the Court/Country divide in the early 17th century, and the "formed" character of opposition in the House of Commons. But in spite of its occasional Whiggish tone, Causes was in 1972 an immensely impressive and satisfying synthesis. Within a few years, however, a frontal attack on the whole interpretative edifice was being mounted by members of a revisionist school associated with Elton and Conrad Russell. Stone, Russell charged, had tried to explain an event that did not happen (a real revolution in 1640-42) in terms of a process (the rise of gentry) for which the evidence "remains at best uncertain". The revisionists' thesis has both negative and positive elements. On the negative side it is dissatisfied with regarding conflict and opposition as the chief characteristics of early Stuart politics. On the positive side, the revisionists have called on us to look at the early 17th century not in light of its supposed connection with a later revolution, but as it really was. An early Stuart Parliament, they insist, was little different from its Elizabethan predecessor.

If this view is right, it becomes more difficult to accept a significant split between Court and Country that might reflect an underlying rise and politicization of the gentry. Then perhaps the causes of the revolution do in fact lie in short-term factors like the ineptitude of Charles I and Archbishop Laud, and we need look no further back than the later 1630s.

Stone has answered some of the revisionist criticism of his interpretation in a new edition of Causes. In the preface, he tells us he decided not to make substantial revisions, but at the end of the book he has added a dozen or so pages of 'Second Thoughts.' Here he says that in a major revision he would knock out some of the sixties social-science jargon, and make a few concessions to the revisionists: first by giving more space to the House of Lords, and second by toning down (though not abandoning) his original portrayal of a growing opposition in the Commons. In some respects, however, his revisions would run counter to revisionist precepts. He would, for example, put more stress on the political intervention of groups below the elite, and bring his treatment of Puritanism more into line with Keith Wrightson's thesis about the role of social polarization. And he would put more, not less, emphasis on ideological conflict in the 1620s. The question remains: how far does this present us with a satisfactory synthesis for 1987?

In one crucial respect Stone is surely right: nothing that has come out since 1972 affects his central argument that the English Revolution was the outcome of major shifts in social, political, and religious forces whose roots lie in the previous century, and was not simply an accident caused by the regrettable weaknesses of Charles I. The choice between this and the alternative mode of explanation favored by historians like Elton and Russell---confined to the detailed narration of unfolding events, with all their accidental

circumstances and misunderstandings--- is clearly a matter of historical temperament and underlying philosophical assumptions. Stone has never ignored the circumstantial details, but has simply balanced precipitants and triggers against the underlying preconditions. In my opinion, the preconditions still hold up pretty well in 1987.

But while the general structure remains convincing, I am inclined to think that some of the details are in need of some revision. First, I think the problem of the Whiggish narrative is even clearer now than it was in 1972. One does not have to swallow Russell's contention that parliamentary conflict was merely an "extension of court faction", or the exaggerations of the influence of the peers through clientage and patronage; the fallacies of these and other aspects of the revisionist case have been sufficiently shown in articles by Rabb, Hirst, Hill, and others. But my own reading of the 1620s debates suggests that people like Sir Edward Coke and Sir John Eliot were a lot less consistently "oppositional" than Causes depicts them. It might be possible to find someone more representative of the complexities in the Court/Country relationship to serve as an example of 1620s politics--Sir Robert Phelips, perhaps.

A second point that I think emerges from revisionist work is that until the late 1630s royal government was less ramshackle and further from the point of collapse than Causes sometimes suggests. Most Stuart government was local government, and this seems to have functioned reasonably well until Charles I put impossible strains on it through Ship Money and the Bishops' Wars. The monarchy could still draw on a great fund of unquestioning loyalty at all levels of society. And in some areas and types of communities the crown and the Laudian church could effectively exploit the unpopularity of Puritan reformers: hence the Book of Sports and the official encouragement of church ales and village revels. Puritanism did indeed contribute to opposition and undermine obedience; but it also produced a backlash in the other direction.

I believe that the role of religion in the causes of the revolution requires greater emphasis than Stone has given it. Many members of the English gentry and middling sort believed themselves to be involved in the ultimate struggle between the forces of good and evil, between Christ and Antichrist, between Protestant Europe and the Pope. Millenarian convictions colored their views of national affairs, whether in the matter of Stuart foreign policy (constantly held to be too friendly to Spain), the toleration of Catholics at home, or the crypto-Catholic Laudian innovations in the Church of England.

Another subject needing modification is the provincial-national relationship. Stone is right that the more exaggerated versions of the localist thesis have been discredited; still, people did take their local identity seriously and were resentful of innovating intrusions by the central government, whether in the form of Laudian ritual, Ship Money, the exact militia, or whatever. Much of the early popular support for the Long Parliament stemmed from this dislike of excessive centralization, which helps to explain the rapid disenchantment with Parliament during and after the civil war, when it found that parliamentary centralization was as bad as, or worse than, the King's.

Finally, we might consider the relationship between the political elite and their inferiors. In his 'Second Thoughts', Stone accepts that we should give more space to the pressures from below, in light of recent work by Wrightson, Buchanan,

Sharp, and others. I heartily applaud this, because one of the most important features of the early 17th century was the increasing politicization of the English middling sort, and to some extent even those below them. Along with the proliferation of political libels and street ballads, the expansion of the electorate, and a great deal else, they remind us that the ferment that preceded the English Revolution cannot be understood in terms of elite politics alone. And to accept this is far more destructive of the revisionist position than it is of Lawrence Stone's.

And so I remove the revisionist mask which I have tried, perhaps not entirely convincingly, to wear earlier in this discussion. Let me conclude with the hope that Lawrence Stone will find some of the points I have raised of possible use in the future, and more sweeping revision of Causes of the English Revolution that one day, amid all the other historical projects that are germinating in his mind, he may find time to undertake. For the present, though, even as it stands, Causes remains in verve, power, and persuasiveness by far the best synthesis of the subject that exists.

Richard Vann, "Lawrence Stone and the History of the Family". Few historical works are worth a second look---or, in this case, a fourth look---ten years after their publication. The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1550-1800 is one of those books. The ideal history of the family is much easier to describe than to write. It would conceive "the family" in its fullest as well as in its most restricted senses. True to the etymology of the word, it would discuss the "houseful"---in other words, the whole residential group, including lodgers, servants, and apprentices---as well as the household and the house itself. It would set the reproductive group in the context of its kin, but also in relationship to friends and neighbors.

The family is a demographic structure, with fundamentally important patterns of fertility, nuptiality, and mortality. While these obviously have to be established, it is important to avoid what might be called the "demographic illusion": the assumption that vital statistics. and especially the reproductive group that is constituted by them, are a privileged representation of "the family". The demographic illusion leads us to see nuclear families everywhere and at all times; but it also tends to persuade us that all the sexual activity in a society can be represented by the recorded births of children, both legitimate and illegitimate. (Has anyone ever encountered the word "homosexuality" in a work of demographic history?)

Furthermore, reproduction should not be limited to procreation. The task of reproduction is finished only when the next generation is itself educated, employed, and beginning its own reproductive careers. This means that childrearing in its broadest sense is integral to the ideal history of the family. And childrearing must be treated with some kind of psychohistorical sophistication, whether Freudian or some other.

This ideal history has not been written: quite possibly it will never be written. But if I had to account for the continued influence of The Family, Sex and Marriage, I would attribute it to its comprehensiveness. It has come closer than any book I know to having something, at least, to say about all topics that the ideal family history would treat.

Stone's history of the family is in the grand style. His thesis is that there is a discernible sequence in the history of the English family, at least in the middle-class, squirearchy, and aristocratic

families. The sequence, I shall remind you, goes from open-lineage (1450-1630) to restricted patriarchal nuclear (1550-1700) to closed domesticated nuclear (1640-1880 and presumably thereafter). Even though the family types overlap in time, as surely they must have, and even though Stone claims no inevitability or teleological unfolding in this sequence, he has been accused of Whiggish linear progressivism.

But there is a deeper issue here. Much of what we have learned about family life in the past has taken the form of typologies, but Stone has not been content with a typology. He has also put it into motion, and provided at least a minimum set of transformational rules. Perhaps Stone got some of the sequence wrong (a question to which we may return); but if the whole idea of such a sequence is misguided, how shall we have a history of family life at all? As ideal types, Stone's seems serviceable enough. There may be reason to apply them with more refinement, or perhaps to invent more subtle ones; but I find it hard to imagine progress in the historiography of family life that would not employ some such types and aim at some such sequence.

His psychological acuity impressed me most as I reread Stone's work. His typology looks like one of family structures; but the family types are distinguished only by differences in the pattern and distribution of affect. Even if there were complete family listings for the squirearchy, upper middle class, and aristocracy, those listings could not tell us which households were restricted patriarchal nuclear and which were closed domestic nuclear. Of course the fact that the argument rests so heavily on psychological data accounts for its greatest vulnerability, since the "facts" of psychohistory are obviously always already interpreted, whereas this is easier to overlook when one is dealing with family listings.

Stone's treatment of those whom he calls "the plebs" of "the lower orders" seems much more problematic. Although Stone has been attacked for his reliance on so-called literary evidence, I think his sophistication in handling such evidence---not to mention his industry in accumulating it---is in fact one of his strong points. It is where literary evidence fails, as it usually does with "the plebs", that the problem starts.

Stone had to rely heavily on the demographic record, and on what inferences he could make from it, in discussing the "lower orders", but in the intervening decade there have been great advances in our knowledge of English historical demography. Let me briefly sketch the new picture of English population movements which comes mainly, though not entirely from the work of the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure. As probably everyone knows, the emphasis of this work now falls on nuptiality, as there is little evidence of an increase in marital fertility in the population as a whole, and the decline in mortality which occurred was not enough to account for anything like half of the observed population increase.

Finally, the demographic index which plays the heaviest role in Stone's analysis is infant and child mortality. Throughout he emphasizes how high it was, inhibiting the investment of parental devotion in children (or perhaps vice versa). It was so high that family limitation would risk default of heirs. Stone believes that infant mortality began to decline in the last decade or so of the 18th century, making possible more affectionate relationships not only between parents and children but also between spouses. Once something like national figures are assembled, the infant mortality rate between 1600 and 1800 appears remarkably stable, except

for a peak in the early 18th century. This stable rate was certainly high by modern standards, but as far as we know it was lower than in the rest of Europe.

Was it high enough to have the effect of mentalites which Stone claims? This of course is the question to be asked; nobody expects him to have written an opus in historical demography, much less one precient enough to anticipate ten years of vigorous research. But if the demographic situation was substantially different from the way he represented it, then the structure of sentiment in the "lower orders" must have been different, too.

Stone refers to "the very late marriage age prevalent among the lower classes, rising in the eighteenth century from the mid to late twenties for men", whereas it was apparently falling rather than rising during the 18th century.It appears that family limitation was confined almost entirely to elite groups (perhaps the peers and the Quakers). Since illegitimacy rates were also low at a time when marriage was being deferred (and denied to a good many English people) there must have been a potent array of cultural institutions to channel and control erotic energy.

Finally, Stone attributes the rise of the companionate marriage, which he finds to be "well established among the lower middle classes" by the early 19th century to early marriages, which were made possible by the rise of cottage industry. Here I think that Stone may have incompletely emancipated himself from the "demographic illusion". The perceived dominance of economic motives only reflects the fact that we have some reasonably reliable series of figures for age at marriage, percentage of definitive celibacy, and real wages. Only when we know a lot more about the affective life or ordinary English people in the 17th and 18th centuries will be able to estimate the true weight of economic motives.

Stone's book is a genuine work of history. So much of it is conjectural that one always has the delight of counter-conjecture and sometimes the even greater pleasure of refutation; yet one still has the sense of continually learning from it. It has a generosity of scope and a clarity of exposition which might even tempt me, some time before I die, to read it a fifth time. And if a classic is, as Mark Twain commented, a book that one wishes to have read, surely a book that one is glad to have reread deserves that title.

REPLY BY LAWRENCE STONE

I. General Intellectual Approach

1. I have a strong desire to achieve clarity in argument. The positive side of this trait is that the reader is never left in any doubt about what I think about any particular problem. He is offered three types of causes of the English Revolution, three models of families between 1500 and 1800, four causes of the Crisis of the Aristocracy, and so on.

The negative side of this quest for clarity is that the result is liable to be over-simplified and over-schematized.

2. I dislike ambiguity. This helps to achieve clarity but it sometimes obscures the fact that all societies, now or in the past, are awash with ambiguity. They are both conflictual and consensual. They are torn between theory and practice, between high ideals and failing performance. Cultural patterns are pluralistic and overlapping, and there are always many of them. Any attempt to bring order out of this morass of disorder is bound to leave many things out. I therefore tend to use Weberian ideal

types, which are useful heuristic devices, but liable to be misleading if taken as literal descriptions of reality.

For example, half the academic world---more in England---seems to be convinced that I believe some total absurdities; for example, that the two sides in the English Revolution were divided on social and economic lines; or that no young people ever fell in love, and no parents ever loved their children, before about 1640.

3. I am a Whig. Ever since Butterfield wrote his ill-judged and ill-argued book, calling a man a Whig has been about the worst thing you can say of an historian---far worse than calling him a Marxist. I am not ashamed to be a Whig, and I see no reason why i ought to be. Whig historians are accused of two crimes. The first is a teleological approach--
-reading the past back from the present. What is wrong with that? If the past can offer no explanation of how we arrived at the present, I see no reason for its existence. The caveats for a Whig historian are never to forget that other societies in the past were very unlike our own, with different values and beliefs; and second that there is no such thing as linear progress in any area of life.

On the other hand I do believe that there was progress in many aspects of life during the Early Modern period-though I have grave doubts about either the sixteenth or twentieth century. I do believe that what Norbert Elias has called "the civilizing process" was at work in the period from 1600 to 1900. Many believe that such moral judgments about the past are no business of the historian. I regard this as the posture of an ostrich, and I strongly disagree with it.

I have always believed that great events, like political revolutions or religious revivals, have many causes, both great and small. Monocausal models, whether on the macro level of Toynbee and Spengler, or on the micro level so beloved by present-day revisionists, are bound to be limited in their vision. The one cannot see the trees but only the wood, the other cannot see the wood but only the trees. Both visions are necessary for a sound historical perspective.

II. The Crisis of the Aristocracy

In this book I tried to do two things. The first was to describe the culture of a class at a particular time. This is the element of the book which I believe still survives unscathed by criticism. The second was to analyze and explain a perceived crisis, first in economic resources and later in social status, while stressing that the crisis was only a temporary one. The basic argument was that the period 1540-1649 was one of transition in the roles and functions of nobles from feudal lords to royal courtiers, officials and generals.

The weaknesses of the book are now fairly clear. First, the political aspects of the story were neglected. There is no chapter on the House of Lords as a political institution, although full treatment was accorded to the growing state monopoly of violence and patronage. Bill Hunt asks the question why the Crown in this pre-1600 period failed to tame the aristocracy. My answer would be that no one succeeded at that time - not Charles I in England, nor Louis XIII in France, nor Philip IV in Spain. The large centralized, bureaucratized, warfare states belong to the late 17th and 18th centuries, not before. Could a Protestant crusade have offered a solution to the problems of Early Stuart monarchy? This is probably the policy which Prince Henry would have adopted if he had lived. But I doubt whether it would have worked. The English were still incapable of fighting the professional armies of

Continental Europe, and even Oliver Cromwell failed in the West Indies. Moreover, the fiscal machinery was not in place to raise the money.

Second, it is possible that I over-stressed the degree of status decline of the class in 1640, in view of the speed with which they bounced back after 1600. Bill Hunt is right to emphasize that when war broke out there was a political split and a status split within the aristocracy, the two roughly coinciding. The split between Parliamentarians and Royalists roughly coincided with that between old peers and new peers, even if the most decisive factor was religious beliefs.

What no one has hitherto sufficiently emphasized is the traumatic experience of the aristocracy in the period 1642 to 1660. About three quarters of them suffered death in battle, or execution, or imprisonment, or exile, or seizure of their estates, or the looting of their county seats, or some of all of these. They emerged in 1600 determined that never again would they allow such horrors to occur. This is why they always rallied round the crown - Charles II in 1660, James II in 1685, William III in 1688, George I in 1714. In 1688-9 they captured the machinery of the state, and used it for the next 200 years to find places and sinecures for themselves and their relatives, to direct policy and war ministers and generals, and to expand the tax-raising and war-making powers of the state.

III. The Causes of the English Revolution

I can be brief here, since my most recent views of the work of the "revisionists" over the past fifteen years is contained in a post-script to the second edition of the book, published by Routledge in 1980.

David Underdown's criticisms are as follows:

1) There was excessive use of trendy social science jargon of the '60s, which has not worn well. True. I would not use this jargon today.

2) The theoretical chapters and the chapter on the causes of the English Revolution are not well integrated. True.

3) The political opposition is portrayed as if already formed by the early 17th century, which is wrong. Maybe there are some hints of this here and there. Today I would still speak of "opposition", but never of "the opposition". There was certainly "opposition" to Buckingham, the Forced Loan, Ship-Money and Laud. Members of this opposition certainly looked back to precedents in the past, and felt themselves to be defending an "ancient constitution" from dangerous innovations in church and state. The exaggerations of the revisionists in minimizing or denying conflict, are if anything more serious than the exaggerations of the Whig historians in denying a general desire for consensus.

4) I underestimated the power of royal government in the 1630s. I think this is true, but I would still argue that the English state in the 1630s was very unlike those of the great European rivals. It had no legitimate independent power of taxation, no standing army, and virtually no local paid bureaucracy. Without these three it was doomed to failure.

5) I underestimated the role of religion, especially the great drive of Puritanism to reshape the world. Here I would defend myself, pointing out that I devoted five pages to the topic of Puritanism as a revolutionary ideology. Oliver Cromwell declared that at first religion was not the key issue.

6) I underestimated the degree of local resentment at the interference of central government in the 1630s. I think this is a bum rap. This

resentment was discussed on pp. 105-7, where I hypothesized that "the alienation of the gentry from the Early Stuart Kings was the product of frustrated idealism, as the later Tory royalism shows". In other words, these gentry wanted to be loyal, but were forced into opposition by royal policies, thanks to which the "harmonious and balanced relationship" which they so much desired was made impossible.

7) I almost entirely neglected the impact on politics of the lower classes. This is true, and I made a bad mistake, as the recent books of David Underdown, Bill Hunt and Anthony Fletcher have proved.

Conclusion

I still think that the tripartite division of causes with Preconditions, Participants and Triggers, although an artificial one, nonetheless works well. It enables the historian to deal fairly with wholly incomparable factors like the rise of the Tudor state, the financial pressures of the 1630s, and the personal character of Charles I.

IV. The Family

Richard Vann suggests that my typology is too rigid. It certainly looks that way, when it is laid out under headings and sub-headings, but I did try (p. 27 of the paper-back edition) to indicate the fluidity and flexibility of the concepts, the way they varied from class to class and family to family, and the way they overlapped with one another. Richard is right to point out that my model is built around changes in psychological bonding, not economic or demographic change of changing household size or composition.

As for the role of infant mortality, I think the historical jury is still out on whether high infant mortality affected maternal attitudes to such highly perishable commodities as small infants in the first year of life. There is also a large and growing literature about infanticide by neglect, which casts doubt on the degree of concern for infants.

The real weakness of the book, as many reviewers pointed out, was its scrappy and unsatisfactory treatment of the poor. Now that the records of ecclesiastical courts have been investigated by other scholars, it is clear that many statements of mine were wrong. I was right to suggest that freedom of choice of marriage partner was in inverse relation to the amount of property at stake in the marriage. But I entirely missed the exceptional freedom of choice exercised by poor adolescents, away from home as apprentices, farm laborers or household servants. The practice of bundling was universal among the poor and lower middling sort in 17th and 18th England, and was a standard accompaniment to a long courtship process which usually ended in a conditional verbal promise such as: "I will marry you if my 'friends' consent"; or "I will marry you, if your 'friends' give 50 with you". Motives for marriage in such circumstances are hopelessly mixed, and it is usually impossible to sort out into clear-cut categories of love or money. Over time, however, emphasis certainly shifted from the latter to the former.

V. Conclusion

The major defects of all three of these books of mine are over-schematization; underestimation of the role of politics, and perhaps also religion; gross ignorance and neglect of the role of the poor. In retrospect, all this is now clear to me, in large part thanks to the skilful and perceptive criticisms of Bill Hunt, David Underdown and Dick Vann. February 11, 1988

NEHA NEWS. The Newsletter of the New England Historical Association.

Association Office: South College, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003. (413-545-2627)
Neal R. Shipley, Executive Secretary
Lori Kran, Associate Editor, Newsletter

The New England Historical Association is a comprehensive organization for historians of all disciplines and fields. Membership is open to all persons or organizations interested in the study, teaching, or writing of history. It is not restricted to New England or American studies. The Association is affiliated with the American Historical Association.

Annual dues (calendar year) for regular members if $10.00 or $5.00 for students and retirees. Life membership for individuals or institutions is $150. An Association Fund exists to assist in supporting the work of the organization. All dues and contributions to NEHA are tax deductible.

Address inquiries to the Executive Secretary.

CALENDAR

APRIL 23, 1988
SPRING MEETING
SALEM STATE COLLEGE

OCTOBER 22, 1988
FALL MEETING
UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD

DECEMBER 3, 1988
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS

APRIL 1989
SPRING MEETING
LOWELL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

OCTOBER 1989
FALL MEETING
SMITH COLLEGE

DECEMBER 1989
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
PLACE TO BE DETERMINED

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

_____

_____ ZIP _____

Affiliation _____

Principal Field of Interest in History:

_____

_____ $150 Life Membership _____ $5 Retiree

_____ $10 Regular Membership _____ $5 Student

Make all checks payable to NEHA or The New England Historical Association

University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Amherst, MA 01002
PERMIT #2

NEHA NEWS IS THE NEWSLETTER OF THE NEW ENGLAND HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, PUBLISHED TWICE A YEAR AND MAILED TO MEMBERS AND SUBSCRIBERS IN APRIL AND SEPTEMBER.

EDITOR:
NEAL R. SHIPLEY
EDITORIAL OFFICE:
DEAN'S OFFICE, SOUTH COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
AMHERST, MASSACHUSETTS 01003

Contributions and suggestions are welcome and invited. The deadline for the Spring Issue is January 11; deadline for the Fall Issue is June 15.

Manuscripts should be typed and doublespaced.