

BOOK REVIEWS

A History of the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station, 1885-1978. By David C. Smith. (Orono, Me.: Life Sciences and Agriculture Experiment Station, University of Maine, 1980. Pp. xvi, 292. Cloth. \$10.00.)

The interaction between science and farming did not originate in the nineteenth century, but, in the United States, it certainly gained formal recognition and structure through state and federal programs designed to improve farming methods, plants, machinery, buildings, and the like. David C. Smith has given us a fascinating account of the Maine experiment station from its origins in the late nineteenth century through the late 1970s. An ironic theme runs through much of the work: as the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station grew in size, recognition, and scientific capabilities, Maine agriculture underwent a more or less steady decline.

In 1885 the legislature passed and the governor signed a bill establishing the Maine Fertilizer Control and Agricultural Experiment Station. The impetus for this station had been building for some time in the Maine farming community. Other states (four by 1882) had already shown the way. At the time, a prime concern of Maine farmers was the doctoring of fertilizer by unscrupulous dealers and the large amounts of grass and weed seed in grain and vegetable seed packages. This amounted to outright fraud. The experiment station could analyze such products and determine their purity, thereby aiding farmers considerably. From the outset the Maine State College (later University of Maine) in Orono housed the station. Disseminating the results of experiments and research through bulletins published in newspapers became the primary method of getting information to the public. The first station, supported solely by state funds, ceased to exist in early 1888.

The demise of the first station occurred because of legislation coming out of the United States Congress. The Hatch

BOOK REVIEWS

Act made available funds to states for experiment stations. The first grant totaled \$15,000 in 1888. From this quite modest beginning the station has seen its budget increase to \$3,341,740 (1975), including \$1.4 million appropriated by the state and \$604,000 from the Hatch Act.

The work undertaken at the station over the years reflects the changes in Maine agriculture. In the twentieth century concerns like poultry, apples, potatoes, blueberries, and dairying have occupied much of the time and resources of its highly competent staff. In addition, the station expanded its physical plant at Orono and purchased Highmoor Farm in Monmouth, Aroostook Farm in Presque Isle, and Blueberry Hill in Jonesboro. Each of the farms carries on extensive work oriented toward specific needs and problems of Maine agriculture.

The experiment station did not escape controversy or difficulty. Smith describes these incidents and problems clearly and in a balanced manner. Perhaps the greatest blow to the station was resignation of Director Charles Woods, a resignation demanded by the board of trustees in 1920. The impact on the station was long lasting, for Woods had made the institution highly respected and had recruited an excellent staff. Not until the 1930s did it regain the kind of momentum and respect it had achieved under Woods.

What makes Smith's history especially attractive is the large number of illustrations in the text. They enhance the narrative very nicely and enable the reader to grasp better the role of the station and changes in Maine agriculture. The same is true of the extensive notes and appendixes.

This volume makes a significant contribution to the history of Maine agriculture and documents well the institution's vital and lasting contributions that have improved the lives of Maine citizens.

William L. Taylor
Plymouth State College
Plymouth, N.H.

Radical Sects of Revolutionary New England. By Stephen A. Marini. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982. Pp. 213. Cloth. \$16.50.)

Stephen A. Marini, associate professor of religion and director of American studies at Wellesley College, has written an excellent study of radical sectarianism that should interest all serious students of Maine history. In his introduction to *Radical Sects of Revolutionary New England*, Marini points out that commonly religious sects are started by individuals who have undergone an intense religious experience that turned them onto new doctrinal paths. He is less interested in the psychological and emotional makeup of the founders of the sects than in the "sectarian process" by which sects are born, shaped, and given a permanent existence. Marini is concerned with such issues as how a sect wins over potential converts and how it develops its own "distinctive social organizations, ideologies, and liturgical symbols" to form a "substantively innovative religious culture" (p. 2).

As Marini reminds the reader, hundreds of religious sects have been spawned in the United States since it became an independent nation, particularly during periods of religious revivalism and social unrest in frontier settlements. He argues that "an examination of religious sects in rural New England during the era of the American Revolution" sheds light on the "sectarian process" of each and provides a basis for comparative analysis of them (p. 1). With those goals in mind, Marini has studied Believers of Christ's Second Appearing (Shakers), Independent Christians (Universalists), and the Church of Christ at New Durham, New Hampshire (Freewill Baptists).

Established in the 1780s, each of these sects mounted a radical, unique assault on the belief structure and practices of orthodox New England Calvinism. They won substantial support in the subsistence farming countryside and villages of Maine, Vermont, and western Massachusetts. By 1820 the three sects had established over three hundred congrega-

BOOK REVIEWS

tions and claimed to have over fifteen thousand followers; altogether they had more than one-fourth of all the congregations and church members in northern and western New England.

Marini's work, based on a wide array of primary and secondary sources, provides a valuable regional perspective on the development of three sects in Maine. The book is well organized, well written, and well worth the price.

Richard R. Wescott
South Harpswell, Maine

English America and the Revolution of 1688: Royal Administration and the Structure of Provincial Government. By Jack M. Sosin. (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1982. Pp. ix, 321. Cloth. \$25.00.)

The Glorious Revolution, in its colonial aspects, has received far less attention that it merits. For colonial scholars, it has been overshadowed inevitably by the War for Independence; for scholars focusing primarily on the home government, events in the colonies have seemed at best a relatively insignificant footnote to stirring circumstances and important constitutional change in England. From the colonial side, there has been a handful of articles and dissertations (applied overwhelmingly to events in a single colony and thus not affording the general view that seems necessary) and one stimulating but controversial study of the entire American scene, David Lovejoy's *The Glorious Revolution in America* (New York, 1972). From the British side, the silence is even more complete; in such well-known accounts of the revolution as those of J. R. Jones and Maurice Ashley, the colonies, for all practical purposes, are simply not a part of the story. It is one of the major values of the extended study being undertaken by J. M. Sosin that it aims to analyze events in the colonies in a manner that pays appropriate attention to

both colonial and home government perspectives. The volume under consideration is the second of a projected three volumes treating the history of the colonies in North America from the Restoration to the death of Queen Anne. In the previous volume (*English America and the Restoration Monarchy of Charles II*, 1980), Sosin indicated clearly the methodological approach he intended to follow; he seeks to find a middle ground between those writings which are essentially "imperial" in perspective, such as the works of Andrews and Gipson, which he sees as placing too much stress on events in London, and the able but limited accounts which have treated events in the colonial settlements in a sort of isolation. This is admirable, and to the extent that he can illuminate the nature of transatlantic links and the problems in establishing them, he performs a valuable service. It must be admitted at the outset that his detailed narrative of local events at times obscures this important and central concern, but the concern is there and it is instructive.

As Sosin reviews the events from 1685 to 1696, and in particular as he analyzes the nature of the insurrections in Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland, he builds a convincing case for their intrinsic importance both in terms of colonial history and in terms of imperial history. When he states that "revolution in 1688 had great political and constitutional consequences on both sides of the Atlantic" (p. 5), he has a valid point. On the one hand, the events confirmed a measure of representative government in the American colonies. In 1702 when Joseph Dudley returned to Massachusetts as governor of the Bay colony he did so under the terms of a charter of William III granted eleven years earlier and also under specific instruction to call an elected assembly to enact laws for the colony; it was a far cry from the situation in 1686 when he had received a commission from James II to preside over a council named by the king without the benefit of a locally elected assembly. On the other hand, if the home government recognized the privileges of locally elected legislative assemblies in the aftermath of 1688, it was no less

inclined than James II to the view that the colonies must remain subservient to England. But given the events of 1688 and afterwards in England, it held that view with a difference; no longer was this aim to be pursued by the exercise of the prerogative of the monarchy but rather by the authority of parliament. This, as Sosin amply illustrates, had important implications in turn. The preoccupation with a long war with France, coupled with the nature of parliamentary politics, where colonial matters were viewed as of secondary importance and were clearly not a "party" issue, meant that any systematic or centralizing approach to governing the overseas colonies was compromised. It was not just that colonial matters were entrusted to politicians of minor standing as a rule; it was more importantly that imperial policy was seldom, if ever, accompanied by the provision of sufficient means for its effective functioning. Colonial administrators were faced with a thankless task; as Sosin rightly observes, "By leaving the representatives of royal authority in America financially dependent on the provincial assemblies, English authorities provided the mechanism for the rise to power of local politicians" (p. 262).

Sosin's analysis of the risings leads to a further, more controversial but important thesis: the risings themselves were far from unified, were not essentially ideological, and were by no means the expressions of republican fervor. It was not ideology nor religious sentiment nor abstract principles that divided the colonists in the late seventeenth century. Rather it was the instability that resulted primarily from the incongruity between the political station and the social status of men denied authority at the upper levels of government but allowed other forms of upward mobility in colonial conditions. "The basic question was, not preservation of Protestantism or self-government, but who would hold office under the mantle of the crown of England" (p.3).

This is a useful study of a period that has received less attention than it should. It is not, however, without its faults. There are some annoying minor slips; for example, the

well-known Cromwellian general Lambert is transformed from John to William (p. 45). More of a problem is an irritatingly repetitious style of presentation; while no doubt intended to make the point crystal clear, it is hardly necessary, in fact rather tiresome, for example, to make repeatedly the observation that Penn was suspected by some of being a secret Jesuit. On balance, though, as an investigation of basic incompatibilities between metropolitan and local interests, it has much that is challenging and important to offer.

Roger Howell, Jr.
Bowdoin College