

The same decades also brought a major restructuring and expansion of sources of student aid, for traditional sources — local patrons, churches, towns and colleges — could no longer meet a rising demand. After 1815 new and far wealthier national educational charities enabled thousands of poor men to attend college and, unintentionally, provided them with a large degree of freedom from local disciplinary agents, including colleges.

To explain this dramatic increase in interest in college education Allmendinger cites “the idiosyncracies of personal history”, efforts by local clergymen and the impact of revivals on youthful piety, but assigns greatest influence to “family size and overcrowding on the farm”. He sees poor and older students as a minority in a “fundamental demographic movement” of New England youth away from overpopulated rural counties. Faced with “declining local opportunity”, attracted by growing demand elsewhere for college-educated teachers and ministers, exceptional numbers of sons set their sights on higher education.

Generally, Allmendinger writes well, employing a wide range of hitherto ignored college records with good effect. Sadly, it must be noted that in his 125 pages of text and notes Allmendinger has not provided sufficient evidence to support many of his observations and stimulating conclusions. For example, his detailed knowledge of social backgrounds and financial resources of students rests upon 50 cases, 47 graduates and three undergraduates of Southampton, Mass., between 1760 and 1860. Southampton, an overpopulated town, was apparently not selected at random. Only 15 students are classed as poor and eight of them graduated from one college, Amherst, between 1823 and 1840. There is no statistical basis for presuming that the ages and birth ranks of 15 Southampton students and the tax rank and assessed acreage of their parents' land, can represent the circumstances of more than 3500 charity-aided or self-financed scholars in New England between 1800 and 1860. If Allmendinger had data on 150 or 200 poor students from, perhaps, 10 randomly selected overpopulated towns or counties, his documentation would be more persuasive. As it is, he has too little evidence to claim, for example, that “no rigid rule determined that students be ... from among oldest or youngest sons, or only from families above a certain economic and social level”. Some readers also will question Allmendinger's treatment of religious motives and the role of revivals, and his reliance on Amherst college sources.

Allmendinger deserves praise for a difficult pioneering effort. *Paupers and Scholars* should stimulate further research into the neglected world of students.

David R. KEANE,
University of Toronto.

* * *

LEONARD DINNERSTEIN & DAVID M. REIMERS. — *Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration and Assimilation*. New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1975.

With the recent expansion of ethnic studies in the United States there has been a noticeable proliferation of textbooks on this subject. While a few publications have broken new ground and added to our understanding of this vast topic, most have been a disappointment. Dinnerstein and Reimers' book falls into the latter category.

The authors' stated purpose is to present a “short survey” of voluntary non-English immigration to the United States from the 1840s to the present and to

discuss the subsequent assimilation of these peoples. Assimilation is, indeed, the theme of this book. Thus, on page 140 they state quite frankly that "we believe that we are on the threshold of the disappearance of the European ethnic minorities" in the United States. Nowhere do they prove it.

The methods the authors employ in presenting their case are quite traditional. In eight short chapters they cover the "Colonial Heritage," the "Old" and "New Immigration," "Ethnic Conflict and Immigration Restriction," "Changing Patterns of Immigration," the "Spanish-Speaking Minorities," "Ethnic Mobility" and "Assimilation". All their sources are secondary and they present no new synthesis.

Indeed, not only do they rely exclusively on secondary sources but on old and discredited theories as well. Thus, they ignore Maldwyn Jones' advice in *American Immigration* (1960) not to divide immigrants into "Old" and "New". They then boldly declare on page one that "today most Americans are unable to trace a pure lineage", implying that these people are the products of random ethnic intermarriage. Nothing could be further from the truth as Harold Abramson pointed out in his *Ethnic Diversity in Catholic America* (1973). Then they attribute large-scale migration to the United States in the 19th century to the "America fever" that Marcus Lee Hansen spoke about in his *Atlantic Migration* (1940). The fact that Frank Thistlethwaite laid this concept to rest in his *America and the Atlantic Community* (1963) seems to have escaped their notice. Furthermore, by accepting Oscar Handlin's discredited theory that industrialization uprooted the peoples of Southern and Eastern Europe (as presented in Handlin's *Uprooted*, 1951), they ignore the recent discoveries of Timothy L. Smith, Josef Barton and myself that the peoples of Southeastern Europe were on the move long before industrialization began.

In their zeal to prove that the 'melting pot' is really working they commit not only the above errors but also distort the very meaning of assimilation. Milton Gordon, in his *Assimilation in American Life* (1964) carefully distinguished between seven types of assimilation and elaborated this further in a recent essay published by Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan in their book on *Ethnicity* (1975). Dinnerstein and Reimers casually dismiss Gordon's approach and imply that assimilation means Anglo-conformity (this is only *one* of Gordon's definitions). In this vein Dinnerstein and Reimers even predict on page 107 that soon "the Chicano movement will fade out." Do they not know that it took the Dutch of New York City two-hundred years to assimilate with their fellow White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, the English? This being the case it is pure wishful thinking to expect the Roman Catholic and part Indian Chicanos to disappear overnight.

It is really unfortunate that Dinnerstein and Reimers did not seize the opportunity to present some new thesis or analysis in their text. Maldwyn Jones, for instance, in the good but dated book cited above not only rejected the division of immigrants into "Old" and "New" but also attacked the bigoted *Dillingham Commission on Immigration* (1911). Philip Taylor, meanwhile, in his more current *Distant Magnet* (1971) added his original research on steamship traffic in the 19th century to enrich the story. For these reasons and those cited earlier the Jones and Taylor books remain far superior to the one under review. Unfortunately, the Taylor work is already out of print and, thus, teachers of immigrant history looking for a text will have to choose between Jones' dated book and other unoriginal and uninspiring efforts such as that of Dinnerstein and Reimers.

M. Mark STOLARIK,
Museum of Man, Ottawa.