

views represent a part, and only a part, of his research, and I am sure Paul Thompson would prefer to be known as an historian and not as an oral historian.

The Voice of the Past is effective because it draws on Professor Thompson's vast experience and recognizes that the problems in applying the oral method are very real indeed. Thompson's argument that documentary sources themselves must be used with such caution that they are really not very different in kind from the interview is developed with grace and skill and may convert many of the sceptics. For example, he cites A.J.P. Taylor, who was told by Richard Crossman the former British Cabinet minister that, "I've discovered, having read all the Cabinet papers about the meetings I attended, that the documents often bear virtually no relation to what actually happened". His conclusion that all sources are fallible and subject to bias and that oral evidence is best in some contexts and supplementary in others, is surely eminently sensible, although I suspect he has exaggerated the opposition of what he describes as "the professional old guard" to the oral method. And surely he is right to argue that the use of the oral method must lead historians to an awareness that their activity is pursued "within a social context and with political implications". Not only does he demonstrate how oral history is involving new groups and classes of people in historical work, but he shows too how the oral method, by greatly extending the potential range of sources, provides the potential for the development of "a more socially conscious and democratic history". Some scholars may find such ideological overtones less than attractive but Thompson's argument is compelling and the implications for written history should be positive rather than divisive. An outstanding book, almost indispensable, *The Voice of the Past* should be read by all those interested in historical studies.

Peter Oliver
York University

Catholicism and History: The Opening of the Vatican Archives. OWEN CHADWICK. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. vii, 174 p. (The Herbert Hensley Henson Lectures, University of Oxford, 1974). ISBN 0 521 21708 3 bd. \$13.95.

From 1612 the Vatican Archives had a permanent home in a wing of the Vatican Palace beside the Library but, apart from some dedicated archivists and a few very select ecclesiastical historians, the learned world was unaware of the richness and historical importance of the Archives until their removal to Paris by order of Napoleon in 1811-1813, and their subsequent return, much depleted, to Rome in 1817. Yet it took over sixty years and some five pontificates to persuade the papacy that far from revealing skeletons, the opening of the Archives to scholars in general would be an immense benefit to the church as well as to scholarship.

Professor Chadwick has documented admirably the series of fits and starts that finally led to the great moment, from the shilly-shallying between 1850 and 1856 in the face of demands from scholars for the record of the trial of Galileo to the fuss during the First Vatican Council (1869-1870) over the minutes of the Council of Trent and the entries in Burchard's diaries relative to the pontificate of the Borgia pope, Alexander VI.

During more than sixty years of official disinclination, the Archives were lucky enough to have two or three dedicated archivists in succession. Mario Marini, who was archivist for nearly fifty years until his death in 1855, supplied copies of documents to various countries, notably England, and whetted the appetites of scholars everywhere. His immediate successor, the German Oratorian Augustin Theiner, published volu-

minously from the Archives and enhanced the impression that here was a goldmine in which every country should have a stake. Theiner was responsible also for the release to a French scholar of the text of the Galileo trial which, as it happens, proved to be not at all as damaging to the church as some had feared and others had hoped it would be. In 1857 he persuaded Pius IX, who had not the faintest interest in history, that all the acts of the Council of Trent some three centuries earlier should be published, now that scholars all over Europe were printing accounts of that Council from other archival sources. He soon was balked by conservative elements in the commission which had been set up by the pope. After twenty busy and stormy years as archivist, Theiner fell from grace in 1870 when he was suspected, not without reason, of passing a copy of the order of business at the Council of Trent to bishops at the Vatican Council (then in session) who were opposed to the procedures in force there. Pius IX suspended him, and sealed off the Vatican Archives forever, or so it seemed.

It was against all the odds that the embattled Pius IX who initiated the furtive steps that finally led to the opening of the Archives to students at large, gave permission to Joseph Stevenson to work there in 1872—specifically at the request of the Public Record Office in London. Although Stevenson was allowed only to select documents for copying by employees of the Archives and not to copy them himself, he was, as Chadwick reminds us more than once, allowed “to roam” the Archives all alone for some two or three years while the world of scholarship thought that the “unapproachable sanctuary” (to quote a frustrated scholar of the times) was utterly beyond bounds. What is more, a second “secret” scholar, the Frenchman É. Berger, was actually allowed in 1877 to copy directly the registers of Pope Innocent IV on behalf of the new French School of Archeology in Rome, but unlike Stevenson of whom he was unaware, Berger did not do his work in the Archives as such but in a window-alcove in the Library. All of this was, as in the case of Stevenson, ‘hush-hush’, in order to keep Austrian and German scholars, then out of general favour with Pius IX, at bay.

But the end was in sight for Pius IX died in 1878. His successor Leo XIII was determined to erase some of the negative impression which the long pontificate of Pius had caused in academic circles all over Europe. In 1879 he allowed Ludwig Pastor, then planning his *History of the Popes*, into the Archives. Shortly afterwards he appointed the historian Cardinal Hergenröther as Archivist, and asked him to draft a plan to make access easier to the Archives. A reading room was constructed from an adjoining coachhouse, and was inaugurated on 1 January 1881. Two years later one of the first of the new, open wave of students, the Protestant historian Theodore von Sickel, head of the Austrian Institute in Rome, silenced most of the curial opposition to the opening when, from the original in the Archives, he showed that far from being a forgery, as was generally assumed, the *Privilegium Ottonis*, revealing gifts of the Emperor Otto the Great to the papacy, was in fact wholly authentic.

Behind Professor Chadwick’s fascinating little volume there lies a wealth of research in archives and private papers, those of Acton and Pastor for example. All the same, the volume bears the marks of having been thrown together, and it is written in some very ragged prose indeed. The title, too, is somewhat pretentious: *Catholicism and History*. The plain fact is that at a time when historical research was in a ferment all over Europe, few in the service of the papacy, least of all the successive popes, had any idea what was contained in the massive Archives, then in a quite disordered state after the return from Paris. Ignorance, I suppose, bred some sort of fear of its contents. Yet there is little sign of any grand policy or of any great speculative stance involving “Catholicism and History”. To put it bluntly, no one, apart from Marini and Theiner, was very interested. When the Archives finally were opened to the generality of scholars in 1881, this was not really because of a more enlightened papal policy, but rather because of the persistent nagging of scholars for half a century and more.

Rhetoric often has it that Leo XIII, in a grand, devil-may-care gesture, “threw open” the Archives to the world in 1881. It would be truer to say that a succession of scholars prised open the doors inch by inch, until, in the end, the only decent thing the Vatican could do was to put an end to the pretence.

Leonard Boyle
Pontifical Institute of
Medieval Studies, Toronto

The Government Party: Organising and financing the Liberal Party of Canada, 1930-58. REGINALD WHITAKER. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977. xxiv, 512 p. (Canadian Government Series) ISBN 0 8020 5401 3 bd. \$19.95 ISBN 0 8020 6320 9 pa. \$7.50.

Mackenzie King once wrote that “it is the little things that count for most in politics as in all else.” So too is Whitaker’s book made worthwhile by the little things, the jewels of anecdote and wit that give its narrative substance and spice. Otherwise, the story of the Natural Governing Party in its prime would be of interest only as an academic bed-time story.

The book is basically a history of the National Liberal Federation from its beginnings in 1930, as a response to what King called the Party’s “valley of humiliation” after the \$700,000 Beauharnois scandal, up to the pipeline debate and the 1957 election defeat. It concerns itself not only with the Party’s organization and finance, but also with its promotion and packaging, and by far the best sections of the book come from Whitaker’s liberal use of the diary of Norman Lambert, Secretary of the NLF in the 1930s and 1940s, which diary now rests in the Queen’s University Archives. Lambert provides both figures on advertising and lists of corporate sponsors, material indispensable for a party historian. The figures, as they say, are revealing.

Other gems include King’s relationship with Vincent Massey, first President of the NLF. One one occasion, King told Massey to stop making public pronouncements on Liberalism, lest he forfeit his claim to the London High Commissionership. He was annoyed as well by Massey’s courting of academics, and regarded Massey’s Port Hope Summer School of 1932 as a challenge to his own personal grasp on party policy. Sneering at Massey’s intellectuals (perhaps with some justice?), he wrote “Everything is a new discovery which fools proclaim from the housetops, & concerning which wise men have long known & been silent.”

But Massey delivered the funds and Lambert the revolution in organization and publicity, including a successful film about King made by and distributed in Paramount Theatres, and King won the 1935 election by a landslide. The extent of the NLF’s organization can be glimpsed in the fact that, in spite of the vote-splitting factor of the entrance of third parties into the race, and in spite of the fact that the Liberal share of the popular vote declined from 45.5% in 1930 to 44.9%, King won 173 seats, while Bennett dropped from 137 seats to 40.

Although Whitaker provides a lively chapter on advertising agencies, detailed sections on federal-provincial party relations and a solid conclusion, he recognizes that the material in the second half of the book can’t match the first:

Sad to say, there was no diary-writing Norman Lambert collecting funds in the postwar era; or, if there were, the records have not been made generously available to the interested researcher. It is a matter of some irony that the closer the Liberals came to financial affluence, the less one can say about the matter with confidence.