
All students of American colonial history will welcome this study of the various plans for preserving the old British Empire put forward by Joseph Galloway during the critical years of the American Revolution and the period immediately following it. In addition to dealing with their background in five thoughtful essays Dr. Boyd has in a series of appendixes printed the plans with explanatory footnotes that add greatly to the value of the volume to the serious reader. First, there is the plan of union that was submitted to the Continental Congress in 1774; then comes that offered to George Lord Germain in 1779 after Galloway had become an exile; then follow the two formulated apparently in the years 1780 and 1781 and presented to Charles Jenkinson; the fifth plan, which the author dates about the year 1785, may never have been submitted to any of the British authorities; and the sixth and last was tendered to Henry Dundas the year after the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787.

Galloway of Pennsylvania and Hutchinson of Massachusetts Bay, perhaps the leading American conservatives in 1775, still await adequate biographical treatment. The former stands particularly as the representative of the not unimportant group here in America who throughout the American Revolutionary War clung to the hope that there might be found some halfway ground between the complete subordination of the American colonies to the will of the British government on the one hand and their complete independence on the other. He therefore took up the work of those who preceded him in the formulation of plans of colonial union. His own proposal, however, went beyond any of the earlier ones in that he was seeking to accomplish the end just stated. The relation of the Galloway plan presented in 1774 to that of the plan of union of 1754 is very close, as Dr. Boyd brings out. Curiously enough, with one important exception the plan finally adopted at Albany by the commissioners has in general much more in common with that favored by the Massachusetts delegation and apparently drawn up by Hutchinson than it has with Franklin's "Short Hints," supposedly the basis for the plan finally agreed upon.

Dr. Boyd regards as "uncompromisable" the issue presented in 1774, which, stated in the terms of the declaratory act of 1766, was that Parliament "had, hath, and of right ought to have full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the colonies . . . in all cases whatsoever." In contrast to this point of view Dr. Weldon
A. Brown in his *Empire or Independence: A Study in the Failure of Reconciliation*, 1774-1783, which also appeared in 1941, defends the thesis that the middle course might have triumphed and the empire have been preserved had there not been a failure of British statesmanship before 1776 while the colonies were still in a compromising mood. As between these two theses the reviewer is inclined to agree with that advanced by Dr. Boyd. The latter, however, does not make sufficiently clear why Galloway's first and greatest effort in 1774 in favor of the middle course was destined to failure. Was it that that year not only saw the beginning of open revolt but also bore testimony to the general acceptance of certain revolutionary theories propounded toward the close of the French and Indian War by such leaders as James Otis and Patrick Henry? Otis had denied that Parliament had the authority to extend to Massachusetts Bay the use of writs of assistance that were employed in England in enforcing customs regulations, while Henry had denied in the "parson's cause" that the Privy Council had the authority to reverse the Virginia twopenny acts. These theories were in direct opposition to well-established procedures and also to the preservation of the authority of the mother country over the colonies. For over a century the Virginia assembly had been obliged to send its legislation to England for acceptance or rejection; incidentally, many laws had been declared void, and before the days of Henry no one raised the charge of tyranny. Likewise, Parliament for over a century had regulated colonial navigation activities and as early as the year 1699 had begun to legislate on a variety of matters involving the domestic interests of colonials, and in this connection had extended to the colonies the force of British statutes. Yet Otis now came forward to announce that this latter practice in the instance under consideration was against the constitution and that the people of Massachusetts Bay were therefore in no way bound by the action of Parliament. But Parliament after the Revolution of 1688 and particularly after 1698 (when by placing in commission, as it were, the great prerogatives of the Crown it came into full control of the Great Seal as well as of those powerful instrumentalities created under it, such as the Privy Council) became the unchallenged legal sovereign power within the limits of England and her empire. Therefore Lord North was quite correct in terms of "legal" sovereignty when he asked (page 9), "By what means is authority [in the colonies] to be maintained but by establishing the authority from Parliament?"

In this connection it is important to bear in mind that probably not a single man in the Albany congress in 1754, which was attended by colonial leaders of the greatest political experience, questioned either the supreme authority of Parliament over the colonies or even the power of that body to alter the constitution of the empire; all the delegates very logically thought that an act of Parliament was absolutely necessary to bring about legally a union of American colonies. In fact, so little did Benjamin Franklin challenge this point of view in 1754 that he actually recommended that the congress send its plan directly to Parliament for ratification without previously referring it to the colonial assemblies for amendment or improvement. But twenty years brought many changes, and by 1774 leaders
of the American revolt against the authority of Parliament, including Franklin, were committed to a thoroughly revolutionary doctrine—or perhaps a counter-revolutionary doctrine in terms of the Revolution of 1688—when, in the words of Madison, they affirmed (page 11):

that the Colonies were coördinate members with each other and with Great Britain of an empire united by a common Executive sovereign, but not united by any common legislative sovereign. The legislative power was maintained to be as complete in each American Parliament, as in the British Parliament.

Thus the issue, as set forth in conflicting conceptions of the authority of Parliament, was, as Dr. Boyd insists, "uncompromisable," for it actually involved the question of the dispersion of sovereignty as against the unity of sovereignty. It was as necessary for King George and Lord North to apply force in 1775 in an effort to preserve the integrity of the British nation as it was for Lincoln to apply it in 1861 in an effort to preserve the integrity of the American nation.

Galloway, who did not move with the revolutionary tide but hoped to see a compromise, viewed the doctrine set forth by the colonial patriots as an invitation to something closely approximating anarchy. One may note in passing that in the early nineteenth century the Spanish colonial patriots propounded a similar doctrine of the dispersion of sovereignty; unlike the Americans, however, with the winning of their independence they continued in logical support of their principle with the setting up of sovereign states, which in turn led to the creation of the Spanish-American nationalities in place of the hoped-for Spanish-American nation.

As to settling the issues between the colonies and Great Britain that developed at the close of the Seven Years' War (the colonies no longer under necessity to look to the mother country for protection from France) Galloway believed that the best way was by representation in Parliament. His friend Franklin in 1754 found such a solution not at all unacceptable—provided that all acts restraining the trade and manufacture of the colonies would be repealed and then presented for reenactment before the new parliament—but by 1768 he had repudiated his former position. In fact, in that year the Massachusetts Bay house of representatives in its famous "circular letter," endorsed by colonial leaders, explicitly and emphatically rejected the idea of such a compromise as mere parliamentary representation. Galloway, forced to put aside his favorite solution and brought face to face in 1774 with the novel and revolutionary late-eighteenth-century American doctrine of local sovereignty, sought a compromise between it and the well-established and constitutional seventeenth-century doctrine of unitary sovereignty. In his famous plan of union of 1774, as well as in most of his other plans, he proposed an adjustment that would give a due measure of recognition to each of those bases of governmental authority. There is a certain irony attached to the fact that it was in reality the Tory refugee Galloway's general theory of a balance and distribution of power between central and local government within the framework of a national sovereignty—although not his specific proposals—that
ultimately triumphed within the United States, while it was the theory of
the dispersion of sovereignty set forth by the American patriots in 1774—
although not their specific proposals—that ultimately triumphed within the
British Empire.

Joseph Galloway is surely deserving of a full-length biography. Perhaps
Dr. Boyd will some day expand his present study so as to fill the gap.

Lehigh University  

James Burd, Frontier Defender, 1726-1793. By Lily Lee Nixon. (Phila-
delphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941. Pp. 198. $2.00.)

It is not necessary to know James Burd in order to understand the his-
tory of colonial Pennsylvania, but a close acquaintanceship with him, such
as Miss Nixon gives us, is one of the best means of coming to feel at
home in his period, especially in the western part of the province. We are
shown Burd building—by an alternate route—a road for Braddock which
was never completed, since before a junction could be made with the road
over which Braddock had already passed on his way to the Monongahela,
news came of the general's defeat and Burd had to retire. We find him
fighting off an attack of the French at Loyal Hanna (Fort Ligonier)
during General Forbes' advance against Fort Duquesne. We see him in
command at Fort Augusta during Pontiac's conspiracy. On his estate near
Middletown he cared for refugees after the second massacre of Wyoming.
During the Revolution he enlisted and drilled companies of patriots.

Miss Nixon hints that Burd may have eventually resigned his colonelcy
because of disappointment at seeing George Washington advanced over
his head to become commander-in-chief of the continental forces. Why
Burd should have regarded himself a rival of Washington's is not, how-
ever, made easy to understand. The author does not leave the impression
that Burd had the qualities of great leadership. His character was solid,
but he had neither the insight nor the driving power needed in time of
crisis. In a letter quoted by Miss Nixon, Edward Shippen described him
as "a gentleman of Sobriety and Industry."

If the book is sound history, it is less successful as biography, for it
fails to catch the tune to which Burd marched. The rich contrasts and
flaming colors of his surroundings are all but missed, so that our sober
Scotsman stands a gray figure against a gray screen, his settings indi-
cated only in outline, not painted in color. One could wish especially that
the Indians, with whom Burd had continual and intimate contact, had been
treated with more care and understanding. There is a vivid sketch of
the Indian treaty at Fort Pitt in 1760, but for the most part the redskins
are allowed to remain shadows, nameless "savages," vague objects of fear
or pity. They do not take shape as real people.

But James Burd makes pleasant reading. In its friendliness, in its symp-
thetetic pictures of Edward Shippen (Burd's managing father-in-law, who
would not let the young man "paddle his own canoe") and Sally Shippen
(Burd's wife, who bore him eleven children), and in its intimate views of
the family in changing moods of hope, grief, disillusionment, and courage, are represented many of the values we are fighting to keep alive in the world today.

Lebanon Valley College

Paul A. W. Wallace


This significant study proves again that the story of an important group such as the New York merchants cannot be presented merely as local history. Between 1815 and 1860 the port of New York was establishing its supremacy over all its rivals. At the same time the merchants of the city, in which class the author includes all business men, were establishing close social and economic ties with the southern planters. Through this relationship they became very dependent upon the South for their prosperity. They were in close touch with southern public opinion also and consequently often reflected it in their own policies. Moreover, they were vitally interested in preventing sectional controversies which would stop normal trade activities.

The chief emphasis in the volume is on the disturbed period between the compromise of 1850 and the secession of the southern states. During this time the New York merchants found it necessary to take an active part in city, state, and national politics to check the radical antislavery forces. Right up to the beginning of the war the influence of the majority of the merchant group was exerted in favor of compromise and peace. When the secession of the southern states showed clearly the chaotic conditions which would result from a divided nation, however, the merchants united in support of the government's policy to preserve the Union by force. Their assistance was of great value to the administration in Washington.

In his conclusions the author raises the question of whether the thesis that the Civil War was a struggle between divergent economic systems may not be a case of oversimplification.

Many sources have been carefully digested in this study, the material is well organized, and the index is complete. The author has made a valuable contribution which no historian of the pre-Civil War period can ignore.

George School
Bucks County, Pennsylvania

Walter H. Mohr

The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt with a Special Introduction and Explanatory Notes by President Roosevelt. Compiled and collated by Samuel I. Rosenman. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. 4 vols. $30.00.)

The second set of The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt begins with the second inaugural on January 20, 1937, and ends with a message to Congress on the construction of new steel cargo ships on
January 16, 1941. The four volumes, published by Macmillan, contain a unique and valuable record of the eloquent expression and vigorous action of an extremely versatile and persuasive president of the United States. Richardson’s *Messages and Papers of the Presidents* is on the whole but a dull and lifeless collection of documents provoked by the problems of government; even in the Wilson papers there is more of literature and philosophy than of a human being. But Franklin Delano Roosevelt stalks as a dynamic individual through every sentence of his diplomatic papers, messages to Congress, campaign speeches, miscellaneous letters and proclamations, fireside chats, and casual and sometimes more than informal press conferences. So vivid is he in his simple, potent language that the reader frequently forgets government and is lured into praising the man himself or quarreling with him.

The multiplicity of subjects covered in the papers defies brief description. The editor has arranged the documents chronologically; each volume has a graphic title that reflects the current dominant concern of the president: “The Constitution Prevails” (1937), “The Continuing Struggle for Liberalism” (1938), “War—and Neutrality” (1939), and “War—and Aid to Democracies” (1940). Regardless of the title, however, the whole gamut of human problems unrolls in every book, and whether a particular paper concerns domestic or foreign affairs it reveals always the basic philosophy of its author. The reader cannot lose sight of the president’s conviction that democracy must be made to work if democracy is to endure. Equally apparent are his beliefs that governments succeed because they remain flexible enough to adapt themselves to changing circumstances and because they protect the poor and the unstable from the rich and the well established. In all the record there is no nineteenth-century warning to the economically discontented that a change in the accustomed order would bring upon them first and foremost evil days. The president has in pungent words been their spokesman. “The agricultural ladder,” he declared in a plea for the tenant, “has become a treadmill.” One-third of the nation, he asserted in presenting the cause of the poor, are “ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished.” And for all he cautioned the nation: “The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.”

In these volumes is revealed Roosevelt’s part in the controversies that raged over the Supreme Court and the National Labor Relations Board, as well as other matters equally significant. Here one may find invaluable notes in which the president explains in careful detail his official statements. Here one may discover statistical information not readily obtainable elsewhere. Here one may watch the slow drift of the nation into war. Here one may see the gentlemen of the press at work. And here, if he wishes, one may find in many places the simple, humorous squire of Hyde Park.

The story of Roosevelt’s eight years in the White House as recorded in the nine volumes published to date is not wholly complete nor entirely unbiased. The president is clearly narrator, advocate, and judge. Opponents will use it to support their charges that the president is narrow-minded, conceited, and uncompromising. They will point page by page to the “I” that
was overworked by another chief executive of the same family name; they will demonstrate with evidence from every volume that to disagree with the man in the White House is to be utterly and willfully wrong; they may show that in destroying privileges without quarter he built up others equally dangerous. Friends and partisans, on the other hand, citing the courage, resourcefulness, and consummate skill of a man unafraid to break with the traditional and plunge into new fields of experimental government in order to preserve government itself, will have little difficulty proving deed by deed a series of accomplishments unmatched in the history of the presidency. The record will remain a must for the general reader, the specialist, and the college or university student who would understand the tragic decade of the thirties. Even high-school teachers of political science should not overlook the volumes, for in them one sees government at work—politics and all.

Temple University

James A. Barnes

Inventory of Church Archives: Society of Friends in Pennsylvania. Prepared by the Pennsylvania Historical Survey Division of Community Service Programs, Works Progress Administration. (Philadelphia: Friends' Historical Association, 1941. Pp. vii, 397. $2.00.)

This excellent little volume is at one and the same time a guide to Friends' records and a historical survey of the origin and development of the Quaker meetings of the commonwealth. Since the inventory is part of a survey planned on a state-wide basis, it is not quite coextensive with the two Philadelphia yearly meetings. Out-of-state subordinate meetings are listed, however. On the other hand, the survey does include a number of meetings in western Pennsylvania, now for the most part "laid down," an inclusion which is the more important because these records are widely scattered and are in no small danger of being lost. It includes Primitive and Progressive Friends, as well as the more familiar Orthodox and Hicksite groups. The volume is prefaced by a very informing historical and descriptive sketch of Pennsylvania Quakerism, and a short historical account is given for each meeting. It contains also a list of Friends' institutions in Pennsylvania, the existence of some of which will doubtless be news to many Friends. Designed primarily as a guide to further study, the present work will none the less be prized as a valuable epitome of the story of Quakerism in the Quaker state.
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Leonidas Dodson