The Roots of Rural Capitalism: Western Massachusetts, 1780-1860
Joseph A. Tiffany, former associate director of the Office of the State Archaeologist in Iowa, offers evidence of varying degrees of Cahokia’s influence in prehistoric culture sequences throughout the state. Readers of this journal will find Tiffany’s chapter especially informative in that it is the first comprehensive statement on Iowa and the Mississippian connection since Dale Henning’s seminal article, “Mississippian Influences on the Eastern Plains Border: An Evaluation,” which appeared in Plains Anthropologist in 1967.

Part four is devoted to “Observations” by Illinois archeologists Jon Muller and Jeanette Stephens, who review the literature, definitions, and concepts associated with Mississippian prehistory. This chapter could well have been placed at the beginning of the anthology rather than at the end. A more appropriate conclusion might have been a summary argument by the editors reiterating their suggested new periodization, with “Middle Mississippian” dating and overlapping “Emergent Mississippian” in the critical two-hundred-year window, A.D. 800–1000. Also lacking is a final discussion of what impact Cahokia’s decline and ultimate collapse between A.D. 1100 and 1500 as America’s greatest metropolis had on the “hinterlands” once the mother city could no longer serve as a gateway center. A final assessment building on the issues raised in the preface, where Emerson and Lewis briefly outline the new scholarly camp (including themselves) preferring Cahokian influences by “intrusion” in contrast to the conventional view of “diffusion” and “local development,” would have reinforced the collective view represented by their contributors.

These problems aside, this is a very useful book and one that every scholar of midwestern prehistory will want to acquire. The University of Illinois Press has released an attractive, well-bound, and very nicely printed volume with many maps and schematics enabling all serious readers to envision and understand the cultural geography of greater Cahokia.


REVIEWED BY SUSAN E. GRAY, ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

It is difficult in a brief review to do justice to the complexity of The Roots of Rural Capitalism. More than a decade ago, Clark fired an opening salvo in what became a major debate over the capitalist transformation of nineteenth-century rural America. The present work is intended, and succeeds, as a synthesis. Its major contribution
is its clarification and broadening of the terms of the debate, which has tended to revolve around various measures of "market orientation" and "profit motivation." Clark's subject is "the evolution of rural capitalism . . . defined not by the adaptation of any one particular set of practices, but by the accretions of a series of distinctive forms and organizations that came together to form a new economic system" (15). His focus is six towns in the Connecticut River valley: Northampton, Hadley, and Hatfield, founded on meadowland in the seventeenth century; and Amherst, Westhampton, and Williamsburg, hillside towns carved in the next century from the older settlements. Clark's multicausal argument is theoretically sophisticated, supported by extensive literary and quantitative evidence, and securely located within a comparative framework. The Roots of Rural Capitalism will doubtless be a departure point for further investigations of the New England countryside, and it offers a valuable counterpoint for explorations of family farming in the nineteenth-century Midwest.

Clark defines capitalism as "the set of social relations in which labor is commonly divorced from the ownership of the land, tools or materials that form the means of production . . . labor power is commonly hired for wages by the proprietors of the land or industrial enterprises, and there exists in society a significant number of people whose principal means of livelihood is . . . wage work" (14). His chief point is that the emergence of rural capitalism was not predetermined.

The result of "several types of change working in parallel" (318), the evolution occurred in two phases. In the first phase—"involution"—from the 1780s through the 1820s, changes took place within the structure of a household economy that rested on freehold tenure and family or locally exchanged labor in the absence of a staple crop and an economically powerful elite. Confronted by population pressure and land shortages, rural families intensified production by taking up unimproved land, expanding livestock raising, and demanding more effort from household labor, particularly women. The result was a higher standard of comfort and consumption, but a strained household economy. From about 1810, the local exchange system of debt and obligation grew burdensome, and women sought to reduce their responsibilities by limiting fertility and purchasing goods that they had once made. Local merchants and manufacturers further altered patterns of household labor and consumption by channeling the local flow of goods and tapping household labor for outwork.

By 1830, the second phase in the evolution of rural capitalism—"concentration"—was underway. Demand for hired labor rose as merchants and manufacturers expanded their enterprises and farmers
increased their marketable surpluses so as to purchase more necessities. Poor families became dependent upon wage work. Greater reliance on cash transactions and short-term credit limited the utility of the older neighborhood exchanges. Whereas the impetus for change during the first phase of capitalist transition had come from within the household economy, it was now more the result of national economic forces.

Any work of synthesis begs the question of what has been left out or where to go next. Clark’s achievement is considerable. Yet despite his insistence on the agency of rural people, *The Roots of Rural Capitalism* has an abstract, schematic quality. This is a local history in which process takes precedence over people. In the first place, as fundamental as local exchanges among households are to Clark’s analysis, they are not well embedded in social and familial networks. An emphasis on network as well as system, moreover, would allow a deeper exploration of relations between farming families and local entrepreneurs of rural origin. Second, Clark’s linkage of the decisions of rural women to limit fertility and to buy household goods is persuasive, but his patriarchal model of household relations is limited because it is so tightly focused on the contribution of women’s labor to the household economy. As Laurel Ulrich has shown, women’s participation in their own exchange networks was equally vital to the health of the household economy. Finally and relatedly, Clark stresses the relationship between rising rural expectations and patterns of household consumption, recognizing the role of women as consumers of store-bought goods. Here some attention to the changing varieties of material life in the countryside might have enriched his analysis of cash as a capitalist tool. It would have allowed, for example, an exploration of the relationship between the evolution of rural taste, shaped at least in part by women, and household maintenance strategies.


**REVIEWED BY ARNOLD COOPER, DEPAUW UNIVERSITY**

Gary Kremer seeks to reclaim from the shadows James Milton Turner, Missouri’s most prominent nineteenth-century African-American political figure. As a case study of post–Civil War black leadership, his book provides a compelling account of the stony road to freedom for Missouri’s African-American citizens.