basis of this evidence. Reasons for the vulnerability of nucleated settlements to desertion, or extensive contraction, are discussed in the context of the economic and social stresses of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, plague, agrarian crises, the move from arable to pastoral farming accompanied by enclosure and the rise of a kulak class, without any one of these factors being seen as dominant. It is, however, noted that proximity to developing towns might have encouraged out-migration and shrinkage. The greater resilience of dispersed and river valley settlements is discussed as are doubts about the view that location on heavy clay was a prime factor in decline. It is concluded that early nineteenth-century maps are a useful guide to medieval forms of settlement and that the frontiers between areas of nucleated and dispersed settlement showed little change between the later Middle Ages and the nineteenth century.

In an attempt to explain different settlement forms the links between nucleated settlement and the midland system of common open-field farming are considered, as are the arguments for and against the determining power of lordship as opposed to that of local communities. Other factors considered include geography, population density, an emergent State bureaucracy, the growth of a market economy, topography and landscape (including the concept of *pays*). It is concluded that no single factor or agency was adequate on its own to account for the diversity of forms, and that a mix of 'material and mental' factors applied in most cases.

An attempt to construct a unifying hypothesis about the evolutionary routes of settlement formation is attempted in the final chapter which addresses the basic problem of what made some places prone to nucleation and others to resist it. The strong connection between geography and form is noted and other main factors are seen to be demographic expansion, the association between nucleation and open common-field systems, different patterns of 'conservatism and adaptability to changing circumstance' which characterised the two main settlement types, and the historical and political contexts in which different communities operated over time. Not least in this constellation of factors was the proclivity to copy and conform to successful neighbouring developments.

While containing little that is new, the scope and authority of this book with its excellent distribution maps and other illustrations, together with concise summaries of each section and succinct conclusions to each of its seven chapters, means that it should be on the reading list of every student of rural history.

M. G. Thompson
Department of English Local History, University of Leicester

Carl H. Moneyhon, *Arkansas and the New South 1874–1929*, Fayetteville, The University of Arkansas Press, 1997, 168 pp.

Carl H. Moneyhon's monograph would hardly warrant mentioning, if it were a common study of the socio-political and economic development of a small American state between

Downloaded from https:/www.cambridge.org/core. University of Basel Library, on 11 Jul 2017 at 14:49:06, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https:/www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095679330000162X

the end of Reconstruction and the beginning of the Great Depression. But the experienced historian from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) embeds the transformation process of Arkansas' society in the wider context of the changes in the southern states around the turn of the century and convincingly deals with the topics of continuity and change in the American 'New South'.

For the American linguist and journalist Henry Louis Mencken, Arkansas was simply 'the most shiftless and backward State in the whole galaxy'. In his analysis, Moneyhon shows that Arkansas was indeed commercially underdeveloped at the end of the nineteenth century, but the ferocity of Mencken's dictum was surely unjustified. Ninety six per cent of the population of the state lived in rural areas, according to the 1880 census. With 15.1 persons per square mile, Arkansas was considerably less populated than the bordering states of Missouri (31.6), Mississippi (24.4), and Louisiana (20.7). Only 50 per cent of all children attended schools. The social structure at the close of the nineteenth century scarcely differed from that before the Civil War. A small upper class of wealthy landowners and wholesale traders dominated commerce and politics; the middle class was composed of white farmers. The growing class of agricultural workers and small peasants were considered to be lazy and boorish and were called 'white trash' or 'hillbillies'. The black population, which made up approximately a quarter of the residents of the state, continued to live in isolation from the society of the whites; racism was 'normal'. There hardly seemed to be a starting point for social and political change in Arkansas.

But the end of Reconstruction rang in a new phase of rapid commercial growth. New companies were lured to Arkansas by tax concessions. The railway network experienced great expansion. Arkansas was no longer nearly completely dependent upon the trade center of New Orleans, but rather received access to the markets of Memphis and St. Louis, thanks to the railroad. The lumber industry became an important source of employment and the health resorts of Eureka Springs and Hot Springs became national tourist attractions. The rate of urbanization also increased; the populations of Little Rock and Fort Smith tripled between 1880 and 1900. But the economic growth of the 1870s was only temporarily able to cover up the basic structural problem of the state. The dependence of the commerce of Arkansas upon cotton production did not decrease in the second half of the nineteenth century, but rather tended to grow. The relatively stable price of cotton after the Civil War led many farmers to the assumption that big money could be made with cotton production. Production was expanded enormously. This dependence upon a single product tumbled Arkansas into a true commercial and social crisis, with the fall of the cotton prices: 'The farm crisis was much more, however, than simple economic hard times: it represented a widespread social disaster' (p. 70). The social tensions increased and the number of lynchings of blacks rose dramatically.

With the application of progressive ideas at the turn of the century and the expansion of state intervention, Arkansas again experienced a short phase of recovery. The schools, the health system, and the streets were improved. Trade and industry were restrained by regulations. But with the end of World War I, the state fell back into a serious crisis. The sinking cotton prices and the fall of the lumber industry were the first signs of the hard times coming. In the 1920s, Arkansas also experienced the rise of religious

Downloaded from https:/www.cambridge.org/core. University of Basel Library, on 11 Jul 2017 at 14:49:06, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https:/www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095679330000162X

fundamentalism and the Ku Klux Klan.The Great Depression additionally aggravated the situation, 'an already bad economy quickly fell to lower levels' (p. 147). Between 1874 and 1929, Arkansas gradually experienced a phase of change and the social and commercial system, which was almost completely agricultural before and after the Civil War, began to experience modifications. But 'the extent of change that was necessary was too great, Arkansas had to come from too far back' (p. 150).

Moneyhon has been able to portray convincingly the social and commercial developments in Arkansas. The author does not lapse into micro-historical details in the process, but rather contrasts the causes of continuity and change in Arkansas with the developments in other American southern states. Two critical remarks in closing. The fact that Moneyhon does without a system of annotation and simply adds a short bibliographical essay is legitimate, but not satisfying from a scientific point of view. On the other hand, the author is very exact in his use of statistical data. However, upon closer examination, the exactness of the figure statements reveals itself to be pseudo-precision in many cases. To name an example, how can Moneyhon honestly claim that the total value of mined coal in Arkansas in 1919 was 5,292,274 dollars (p. 99)? Nonetheless, Moneyhon's highly readable work is a welcome addition to our understanding of the American south around the turn of the century.

Simon Geissbühler
University of Bern, Switzerland

John Rule and Roger Wells, *Crime, Protest and Popular Politics in Southern England, 1740–1850*, London, The Hambledon Press, 1997. 257 pp. £38.00. ISBN 1 85285 076 0.

Between them John Rule's and Roger Wells's research has encompassed the entire length of the southern coast from Cornwall to Kent. This volume represents a combination of past work reprinted – six chapters in all – and four new essays on the related themes of popular protest, political radicalism and crime. The book's stated objectives are to show that southern working people were neither fatalistic nor apathetic in the face of exploitation, extreme poverty and repression; rather they mounted stern resistance as rioters, criminals or firesetters.

In the jointly authored opening chapter they present an overview of the full gamut of popular protest from food rioting, the Wiltshire Outrages and Swing to the anti-Poor Law disturbances. In the analysis of social criminality, previous authorities such as Bohstedt and Hobsbawm and Rudé are brought to book: the former for his 'riot as community politics' thesis, the latter for understating and misinterpretating Captain Swing, which possessed a greater political significance and impact on the Reform Bill crisis than has previously been acknowledged. And whilst the authors accept that resistance to the introduction of the New Poor Law and the formation of Chartist branches were never as strong as in the North, southern England did at least experience sufficient unrest to preclude a reputation for passivity.

Downloaded from https:/www.cambridge.org/core. University of Basel Library, on 11 Jul 2017 at 14:49:06, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https:/www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095679330000162X