

observed in all marriages. In the earlier decades there was no objection to free Negroes being taught to read and write, but after the Gabriel insurrection of 1800 and that of Nat Turner in 1832 the right of educating their children and of assembling together were curtailed almost to prohibition. Yet, free Negroes not only were not behind these insurrections but were instrumental in reporting and thus frustrating many plots of slaves.

The economic opportunities through small jobs, skilled and unskilled, in the towns and cities, were good for the free Negroes, who displaced white laborers by their acceptance of lower wages and their docility. They were the main dependence in most skilled manual labor, and the deportation acts of the legislature largely failed of execution because of the demand for their services. As to character, the antebellum free Negro was probably no more thievish than slaves; was not so criminal in capacity or tendency as he was believed to be. The charge that he incited slaves to rebellion was unfounded and his laziness and improvidence were probably less than might have been expected under his restricted circumstances. There were numerous remarkable examples of thrift, economy and integrity.

The monograph shows signs of thoroughness, contains a good bibliography of sources and shows a balance of judgment worthy of imitation in more pretentious works on the Negro.

GEORGE EDMUND HAYNES.

Fisk University.

SULLIVAN, J. W. *Markets for the People: The Consumer's Part.* Pp. viii, 316. Price, \$1.25. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913.

Mr. Sullivan's interest in markets, he tells us in the introductory chapter, dates from his services on the commission on public utilities appointed by the National Civic Federation. While traveling for a year or more in America and Great Britain, as labor investigator for the commission, he gathered such data relative to the markets as a casual observer might. Later, on two different trips through the continent, he continued his observations and studies. Then for several years, while he was assistant editor with Mr. Gompers, the rising discussion of the cost of living brought to the editorial offices in Washington a stream of printed matter on the subject, all of which Mr. Sullivan was called upon to digest. Again, in 1912, he went to Europe with the special object of studying markets in Switzerland, and he made inquiries also as to the market systems of Paris, London and Berlin.

Among the more interesting and suggestive conclusions reached by the author are the following: (1) Great public markets are uncertain investments for cities at the present time. In support of this conclusion he cites the transition in several forms of the marketing situation of the day, such as the changes brought by subway and tunnel in methods of distribution of produce by freight, the possibility of transportation companies so improving their market yards and piers as to take away trade from public wholesale markets. (2) He objects to the terminal market plan, such as has been advocated by Hon. Cyrus C. Miller and others of New York City, on the grounds that it

would be impossible to force New York's scattered business of wholesale marketing into public markets, and because the tendency in metropolitan cities is dissemination and not concentration of sales of produce in bulk. (3) He concludes that a saving of 20 per cent to the consumer of moderate means can be brought about through developing to the fullest extent the legitimate trade of the pushcart. As to the quality of the stock sold by the pushcart peddlers, he quotes from a report, published on March 26, 1913, issued by the commission appointed by Mayor Gaynor to investigate street venders. The report of the commission was corroborated by the aldermanic committee's report on the same subject published the following month. The commission says: "It has been found that the foodstuffs sold by the peddlers are nearly uniformly wholesome. These and other commodities are sold at a considerably less cost than obtained in stores." The aldermanic committee's report he quotes as follows: "The quality of food and merchandise sold from these pushcarts is in the main of as good a quality as can be bought anywhere else in the city, and much cheaper." He discusses the phenomenal success of pushcart markets in European cities, especially those in Paris, Berlin and London. (4) His fourth significant conclusion is that the open air market is worthy of greater public effort. The open air market, like street vending, has been opposed in many American cities by boards of health and others on the ground that there is not ample protection of foods from dust and unwholesomeness. Mr. Sullivan urges that these objections can be largely overcome. He points out that European cities have succeeded in giving ample protection to their open-air markets. The open-air markets in European cities have thrived whereas the closed retail markets have been less successful. Twelve of the 30 open-air markets in Paris are held three times a week while 18 are held twice a week. There are over 17,000 standing applications for places in the market. In the 30 markets there are now 6,296 stands, 2,600 of which are fruit and vegetable, 402 fish, 430 cheese and eggs, 77 bread, 540 meat, 308 delicatessen, 991 manufactured merchandise. The number of venders using these stands probably totals more than 15,000. This is in the Paris market alone. He avers that a similar development in American cities would most definitely decrease food costs to the consumer.

CLYDE LYNDON KING.

University of Pennsylvania.

USHER, ABBOTT P. *The History of the Grain Trade in France, 1400-1710*. Pp. xv, 405. Price, \$2.00. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Usher has published his book without more fully mastering his material. One is not reassured to read in the appendix upon bibliography [the brevity of which he explains by the rather arbitrary statement that "a complete list of the sources would be too voluminous in extent and too general in character to be of any assistance"] that "the quantity of material that was available forced me to limit my work to what may be called the Parisian and Lyonesse manuscripts. . . . It was impossible to examine this material thoroughly. . . . A few days' work was