

BOOK REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTES

EDITED BY NORMAN B. WILKINSON

William Penn: Quaker Hero. By Hildegard Dolson. (New York: Random House, 1961. Pp. 186. \$1.95.)

Most biographies of the great and good man who founded Pennsylvania tend to leave him a remote and somewhat unreal figure, but this enjoyable life of William Penn for young readers is remarkably successful in presenting him as a real and human person. The author has been thorough in her research within the limitations imposed on a work in the juvenile field, where a story must be told simply and directly, without discussion of controversial points. Although there is no documentation, the informed reader will occasionally catch a glimpse of the adroit use of such sources as the diaries of Samuel Pepys for details of Penn's youth, or the writings of Penn himself for descriptions of Pennsylvania in his day. The method, of course, is partly that of the novelist in imagining what Penn and others thought, but this is not uncommon in some biographical writing at the present time.

There are a few minor errors, which it may be assumed will be corrected in a second edition. Thus, the manor house at Pennsbury was not completed during Penn's first visit to his colony, and he could not have thought of his wife Gulielma walking up to its "wide-columned porch." Indeed, it never did have a "columned porch." But it would be misleading to lay much stress on such errors. The essential point is that Miss Dolson has written an entertaining and swiftly-paced narrative of William Penn's life, which gives a convincing and realistic impression of Penn as a living man. The brief bibliography offers excellent suggestions for further reading, and the book is attractively illustrated by Leonard Everett Fisher. It is a good introduction to William Penn and his times.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission DONALD H. KENT

William Shirley, King's Governor of Massachusetts. By John A. Schutz. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va., 1961. Pp. 292. \$6.00.)

Professor Schutz has written the first complete biography of William Shirley, governor of Massachusetts from 1741 to 1756. Shirley was born into an aristocratic family and was educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, and at the Inner Temple. He lost most of his inheritance through unwise financial speculation and was obliged to make his own way during most of his adult life. He decided to leave England in order to better his lot

as an attorney and public official in Massachusetts. He succeeded in obtaining a letter of recommendation from the Duke of Newcastle, and he lost no time in presenting the letter to Jonathan Belcher, governor of Massachusetts, after disembarking in Boston in the fall of 1731.

Governor Belcher, who was eager to please the duke, appointed Shirley to a post in the admiralty court at Boston. Shirley soon left the bench, however, to become advocate-general of the court. He used patronage and persuasion to form alliances with the leading merchants and politicians of Boston and London, and he exploited his influence with Newcastle to undermine Belcher's London support. The governor was a tough warrior, but Shirley was such a shrewd and ruthless politician that he succeeded in clawing Belcher from office in 1741. Moreover, Shirley's political maneuvers were so skillful that he succeeded in making himself the leading candidate for governor while he was engaged in leading the opposition's assault upon Belcher's administration.

Shirley made haste to distribute the spoils of office among his friends, relatives, and political allies as soon as he had received his appointment as governor. The means by which he had become governor and by which he maintained himself in office were probably not particularly reprehensible by the standards of eighteenth-century British politics. They were quite ruthless, in any case, and they were as effective as they were ruthless.

It must be said, however, that Shirley was something more than a spoilsman. He proved himself to be an able administrator and a patriotic defender of the British Empire against its enemies. He organized frontier defenses against the French and their Indian allies during King George's War, and he aroused the people of the New England colonies by his urgent calls for an attack upon the fortified French naval base at Louisbourg on Cape Breton Island.

The New Englanders, and especially the people of Massachusetts, raised a strong force of militia for the Louisbourg expedition. Shirley worked tirelessly to raise the men, money, and supplies needed to insure success, and he obtained the support of a naval squadron commanded by Commodore Peter Warren (who agreed with some reluctance to sail northward from his regular station in the West Indies). The attack upon Louisbourg was then made in the spring of 1745, and the garrison of the beleaguered fortress was forced to surrender shortly after the middle of June.

The fall of Louisbourg marked the apogee of Shirley's career. Unfortunately, Louisbourg was returned to France in 1748 as the price which Britain had to pay for evacuation of European territory which had been overrun by French armies. The return of Louisbourg was a severe setback to Shirley's hopes and plans, and it was followed in 1754 by another reverse when the plan of intercolonial union drawn up by the delegates to the Albany Congress was rejected (or ignored) by the several colonies. Shirley was, as Professor Schutz has pointed out: "the only American governor to induce his legislature to consider the matter, and he was the only leader to press the idea upon the home government."

Additional setbacks befell Shirley shortly after the Albany Congress. He

attempted to organize attacks upon the French strongholds at Crown Point and Fort Niagara in 1755 and 1756. The French held their ground, however, and succeeded in inflicting a severe defeat upon Shirley's New Englanders at Oswego in the summer of 1756. Shirley was recalled soon afterward, and Thomas Pownall succeeded him as governor of Massachusetts.

Shirley was appointed governor of the Bahama Islands in 1758. The Bahamas were but isolated outposts of empire, however, and Shirley's appointment was scarcely more than a graceful way of giving him a pension in his declining years.

Professor Schutz has written a fine, scholarly book. It deserves high praise, but the reviewer wonders if the author is justified in accepting Shirley's estimate of the abilities of Governors James DeLancey (New York) and Benning Wentworth (New Hampshire). Readers of PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY may be interested to learn, incidentally, that Shirley was on good terms with Governor Robert Hunter Morris of Pennsylvania.

Lehigh University

GEORGE W. KYTE

The American Tory. By William H. Nelson. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961. Pp. 194. \$4.80.)

In a decade when conservatism is again a subject for sympathetic inquiry, Mr. Nelson moves with the tide in undertaking a reappraisal of that enigma of the Revolution, the American Tory. This work originated in 1958 under a variant title, "The Loyalist View of the American Revolution," as a Columbia University dissertation. That title neatly delineates its province, for it is a study of the thought and reactions of the Tory-Loyalists before and during the American Revolution. It deals with their actions only in so far as they reveal the thought which produced them. As an effort toward rectification the volume proceeds from the premise that "The Loyalists . . . suffered a most abject kind of political failure losing not only their argument, their war, and their place in American society, but even their proper place in history."

Recognizing that the alienation of the Tory, both as an individual and as a group, was a cumulative experience, the author evaluates perceptively the unenviable position of the Tory cause. He believes that this label disguises the extent to which the Tories were themselves critical of the *status quo* and divided over the solutions which ought to be attempted. The Tory oligarchs supported measures which could prevail only with British assistance. Such dependence reveals the inherent weakness of their cause. The conservative leaders failed to counter the intercolonial organization of the revolutionists, thus leaving divisions within the radical movement unexploited. A major liability was the Tory failure to "develop and proclaim an agreed alternative to the revolution." Finally, without even a bow to the J. Franklin Jameson position, Mr. Nelson concludes that the departure of the Loyalists did not produce social or narrowly political consequences but rather "philosophical consequences," in that their flight inhibited for the

future a sympathetic American comprehension of European social and political philosophy.

Promising or provocative though these judgments may be, the greater portion of this work disappointingly adds little to our understanding of the Revolution or of the Tory mind. The focus of attention is properly on the Tory leaders, Thomas Hutchinson, Joseph Galloway, Jonathan Boucher, etc.—indeed this reader began to wonder whether there were no unknown Tories—but the interpretation of their thought is pedestrian. Other works, such as Leonard W. Labaree's *Conservatism in Early American History* (which oddly enough is not cited), long ago established the fact that the conservatives were alarmed by the implications of the Revolution. This volume might profitably have explored the problem of why some conservatives became Tories and ultimately Loyalists, while others who were equally conservative, did not. Companion cases are to be found in Joseph Galloway and John Dickinson, and both men's views are cited in the pre-independence debate. Yet the former apparently embraced loyalism without a qualm, while the latter's rejection of this course is dismissed with the enigmatic statement that even in rebellion he "revered the King."

Students of Pennsylvania history will read with incredulity that "class conflict in Philadelphia [1775-76] broke the revolutionary movement there in two." The pair of chapters on the war-time Tory experience varies substantially in value. The frustration and disenchantment of those who remained in America to face the hostility of their neighbors, the rejection of their services and advice by British commanders, and the finality of Yorktown, is ably presented. The counterpart chapter on the refugees, although high in human interest, misses the point that their experiences, far from being uniquely significant, are merely characteristic of the reactions of those exiled from leadership by civil upheaval. Finally, except for Hutchinson, Mr. Nelson selects his Tories from the Middle Colonies.

Whatever the Tory's "proper place in history," it is doubtful that this volume establishes it.

Dickinson College

WARREN J. GATES

The Negro in the American Revolution. By Benjamin Quarles. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va., 1961. Pp. 231. \$6.00.)

The focus of this book is chiefly military. Eight of its ten compact chapters deal with various phases of Negro participation in the American and British war efforts during the Revolution. There is more to this story than one might assume. Professor Benjamin Quarles of Morgan State College in Baltimore has explored the subject fully and specifically, giving us not only its general outlines but thumbnail biographical sketches sufficient to support a raft of new applications for membership in the D.A.R. and similar patriotic societies.

The book opens with a restrained and judicious account of the death of Crispus Attucks in the Boston Massacre, which is followed by brief notice

of the role of Negroes in the battles of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill. The scene then shifts to Virginia for an exploration of Lord Dunmore's invitation to slave enlistment in the royal forces. The third chapter provides an analysis of the impetus given to Negro betterment by the religious, humanitarian, and philosophical impulses of the Revolutionary era. The treatment of the relation of the Declaration of Independence to the cause of the Negro is quite sketchy, however, and will be disappointing to those interested in political theory and intellectual history. Nor is much said of the development of antislavery legislation and court decisions during the Revolution. Pennsylvania's emancipation law of 1780, for example, is barely mentioned.

Three chapters trace in some detail the recruitment policies of the American states in relation to Negroes, both slave and free, and their services in the Continental Army and in state forces, on land and on sea, at the front and behind the lines, in uniform, and as civilian laborers. One of the most interesting points made in this connection is that Negroes generally served in racially mixed units during the Revolution. The New England states led the way in utilizing Negroes as soldiers; Georgia and South Carolina to the end refused to do so. Many of the Negroes were already free, but many others won their freedom as a reward for military service. Negro morale was high, the author notes, because the armed forces offered the possibility of an improvement in status.

Three more chapters cover similar subjects in the context of British policies and practices. Professor Quarles points out that thousands of slaves fled to British lines, and after the war large numbers of them were evacuated with the British forces. Slaves who belonged to Tories or who had been acquired as property by British soldiers did not immediately win their freedom, and even those who were freed found life hard in their new environments—the West Indies, Canada, and Europe. Twelve hundred who settled in Nova Scotia soon removed to Sierra Leone. The slaves carried off by the British caused a troublesome diplomatic issue which disturbed Anglo-American relations for many years.

The final chapter returns briefly to the progress of emancipation and restriction of the slave trade during and after the Revolution. There is an excellent summary at the end. The author concludes not only that thousands of Negroes won their freedom directly as a result of the wartime demands for their services but also that ultimately "the colored people of America benefited from the irreversible commitment of the new nation to the principles of liberty and equality."

The book is based on extensive research in primary sources, attested by voluminous footnotes and an impressive bibliography. The author has used a large number of manuscript collections as well as a great variety of printed documents. The study is well organized, with good transitions, and is competently written. It is a very creditable monograph, a worthy companion piece to *The Negro in the Civil War*, an earlier perceptive study of the American Negro in wartime by Dr. Quarles.

Pennsylvania State University

IRA V. BROWN

American Protestantism. By Winthrop S. Hudson. [Daniel J. Boorstin, editor, The Chicago History of American Civilization.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. Pp. 198. \$3.95.)

What a splendid and helpful little book Dr. Hudson has written as a contribution to the "Chicago History of American Civilization," a series of forty volumes under the competent editorship of Dr. Daniel J. Boorstin. There are those of us who assembled their fragmentary theological culture in the days when in the eyes of our learned professors all Protestant history came to a triumphant end as John Calvin and John Knox sounded forth on all the trumpets, "No Popery" and "No Prelacy!" As we, who are steeped in this ancient culture, read *American Protestantism*, we are for the fleeting moment one with "stout Cortez" as he and all his men stood "silent upon a peak in Darien."

Dr. Hudson has written the history of what might be called, if one were looking for a title other than the one chosen, "The Rise and Decline of American Protestantism." I hope it will be noted that I didn't use the terms "The Decline and Fall." For I believe that Protestantism is still and must remain a vital factor in American civilization.

The author reviews the successive epochs in the life of American Protestantism beginning with colonial days, in which America was definitely Protestant. The Protestantism of those days was of a type which laid special emphasis on the right of private judgment. Over half of the colonial congregations in 1775 were Congregational, Presbyterian or Baptist. On the other hand, there were only fifty-six Roman Catholic congregations throughout the colonies. To put the situation in percentages, 98.4% of the country was Protestant, 1.4% Roman Catholic, and less than 1% Jewish. These percentages were not the result of a planned effort to exclude others than Protestants from the colonies. What Dr. Hudson calls a "maxim of moderation" resulted in a growing tolerance of all creeds. Theologically, however, Calvinism played the dominant part.

Several factors contributed to the flowering of tolerance in early America. Among them were the breakdown of the parish system, "the decisive voice which the laity began to exercise in the determination of church affairs," and particularly "the impact of Evangelicalism." By "Evangelicalism," Dr. Hudson means what some of us today would vaguely call, for want of a better term, "revivalism." In this particular case, "Evangelicalism" means the type of preaching which led to the "Great Awakening" in which the historic figure is George Whitefield.

The close of the Revolutionary War and the emergence of a new nation brought with it not merely economic and political problems, but a genuine concern over the spiritual life of the people of America. This concern found its expression in the "Protestant Counteroffensive." Protestantism faced "the twin threats of 'infidelity' and 'barbarism.'" Freethinking and infidelity were the children of the French Revolution. Barbarism was the child of pioneer living. Against these forces, revivalism was called into play, a type of revivalism, however, different from that of the colonial period. Colonial revivals were spontaneous. Those of the early nineteenth century

were stimulated. In these, preachers of the Peter Cartwright type played no little part. Another weapon used to control the rising tide of irreligion was found in the so-called Voluntary Societies, which were organizations of a missionary and educational nature sponsored on an interdenominational basis.

Interesting reference is made to the great "Valley Campaign" of 1829-31—a warfare against infidelity in the Mississippi Valley to which settlers in increasing numbers were thronging. Societies such as the American Education Society, the American Bible Society, the American Sunday School Union, and the like, played an important part in carrying the gospel to the settlers on the frontier. And preachers, many of whom were none too sympathetic with "book larnin'," thundered the dangers of the neglect of salvation. But under it and through it all, those who led the counteroffensive were moved by a genuine piety and a concern for their fellow Americans.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, there was a re-alignment of Protestant forces. The Methodists and the Baptists took the place of the Congregationalists and Presbyterians, both in numerical leadership and in influence. The second half of the nineteenth century was marked by the rise of the Y.M.C.A., the institutional church, and a stress upon religious education. Beginning with the twentieth century, America may be said to have entered upon a post-Protestant era, although it cannot be denied "that much of American culture continued to be informed by a distinctly Protestant ethos."

The post-Protestant era was the product, *inter alia*, of the tremendous tide of immigration from non-Protestant countries, Protestant complacency, and theological erosion. As a factor in theological erosion, Dr. Hudson cites the rise of what is called the New Theology, characterized by its lack of normative content, "the general mood of satisfaction with things as they are or are about to become," and "the fading of any distinction between the church and the world."

Presbyterian Ministers' Fund, Philadelphia

ALEXANDER MACKIE

The Papers of Alexander Hamilton. Edited by Harold C. Syrett and Jacob E. Cooke. Volume I, 1768-1778, and Volume II, 1779-1781. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961. Pp. 627, 710. \$12.50 per volume.)

The publication of Alexander Hamilton's writings and letters is another contribution to a widespread effort to make generally available most of the significant documents of American history. These first volumes trace the career of the future Federalist leader from his boyhood days in the West Indies to his realization of military glory and the surrender of Cornwallis' forces at Yorktown in 1781.

Professors Syrett and Cooke and their staff are to be congratulated upon their diligence in gathering sources from widely scattered holdings. Their collations and annotations of the papers are useful, complete, but never intrusive. Acknowledgment also must be given to Columbia University, the Rockefeller Foundation, and *Time, Incorporated* for their financial assistance.

A useful criterion for judging the value and pre-eminence of these volumes is to compare them with earlier publications of Hamilton's writings. Henry Cabot Lodge's edition made no pretense at being exhaustive. The notes of the present editors indicate that John C. Hamilton may have emulated the techniques of Jared Sparks in his edition of his father's papers. Significant passages often were deleted, and numerous stylistic changes were made. Furthermore, this edition, at least in the years covered thus far, contains a substantially greater quantity of materials. Although additional Hamilton letters may yet come to light, it may be said that this is an authoritative work which will be of immense value for years to come.

Hamilton's first extant letter provides an excellent indication of that restless and ambitious spirit so generally attributed to him. "[M]y Ambition is prevalent," he wrote a boyhood friend in 1769, "that I condemn the grov'ling and condition of a Clerk or the like, to which my fortune, &c. condemns me and would willingly risk my life tho' not my Character to exalt my Station. . . . I wish there was a War." Such ambition was usefully complemented by resourcefulness and energy. Thus fortune, with some assistance from human endeavor, was generous to Hamilton. For the next three decades, he played a significant role in American affairs, demonstrating time after time that uncanny knack of being present when and where history was being made.

These first volumes cover Hamilton's formative period. Though he was not yet an actor on the center stage, surely he was one of the rising young stars, moving ever closer to a prominent position. In these thirteen years, one can follow Hamilton's amazing and meteoric rise from obscurity to the ranks of the leading counsels in the nation. Within two years after his arrival from St. Croix as a youth of seventeen in 1772, he plunged headlong into the raging debate on the nature of the colonies' relations to the mother country. Thus he made his niche as a revolutionary pamphleteer with *A Full Vindication* and *The Farmer Refuted*, his replies to the Tory tracts of Samuel Seabury. In addition, his *Remarks on the Quebec Bill* in 1775 adroitly fanned the flames of religious prejudice to further the cause of independence.

In 1776, Hamilton became a captain of artillery in the New York militia, and somehow, within a year, George Washington was impressed enough to invite Hamilton to serve as his aide-de-camp. Unfortunately, the editors have not turned up any new information on the intriguing question of how a seemingly obscure militia captain came to Washington's attention. Hamilton's military years well attest to his inexhaustible energy and wide range of interests. As Washington's aide he prepared much of the general's correspondence and documents. (These are briefly summarized and calendared by the editors.) Hamilton also was in constant communication with John Jay, Robert R. Livingston, and Gouverneur Morris of the New York Committee of Correspondence, in which he displayed a keen appreciation of the conduct and nature of the war. The fascinating pay book notes, which have been brilliantly analyzed elsewhere by E. P. Panagopoulos, are included here in their entirety.

During these war years, Hamilton the soldier clearly anticipated Hamilton the political and financial statesman. Already he was bemoaning the jealousies and parochialism of the states. To George Clinton, he lamented that the outstanding public figures were serving their state governments rather than the Congress. "How can the common force be exerted," he asked, "if the power of collecting it be put in weak[,] foolish and unsteady hands?" Being at the center of military affairs, he constantly encountered inefficiency and fumbling by the weak central government. Hamilton always was concerned with power and its implementation; surely then his wartime experiences with the confederation were as important as his later misgivings involving economic weaknesses, real or imagined, in leading him to seek a strong national government. "I dwell upon the faults of Congress," he told Clinton in 1778, "because I think they strike at the vitals of our opposition and of our future prosperity." His most formal and detailed criticisms of Congress and the Confederation are contained in the *Continentalist* papers written in the summer of 1781, which clearly foreshadowed the Nationalists' attacks on the Articles of Confederation during the next six years.

These papers read like biography. They contain the outlines and many details of Hamilton's years of apprenticeship as a national leader, but more importantly, they vividly reflect the character and personality of the man. We see, for example, that while Hamilton was the consummate man of action, he also was given to reflection and speculation. These writings are a useful reminder that no man of Hamilton's stature can be portrayed simply and one-sidedly. No man is all saint or all sinner; Hamilton, however, more so than most American historical figures, too often has been depicted as one or the other. Perhaps in the future, these published papers, and those of other familiar figures, will properly be utilized to enrich our historical literature and lend more relevance and meaning to our interpretations and judgments.

The Pennsylvania State University

STANLEY I. KUTLER

The Antifederalists: Critics of the Constitution, 1781-1788. By Jackson Turner Main. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va., 1961. Pp. 308. \$7.50.)

The significance of an historical epoch is properly determined by the degree to which it embodies the relevant past, affects present urgencies, and conditions future developments. Further, the determination of an epoch's magnitude must follow an assessment of its geographic breadth, its institutional growth and, perhaps more than anything else, the extent to which it serves as a period of summary and a point of departure. Within this framework of review American history in the latter half of the eighteenth century affords several illustrations of such epochs or periods.

These periods of evaluation and resolution, discernible in the past, are also to be seen in the history of history itself. Tireless in the pursuit of an interpretation which might provide a key to better understanding, the

good historian balances old and new evidence against available explanations and presents us with a new point of departure. If this criterion for appraising a book is accepted, *The Antifederalists* comes off with fairly high marks. Perhaps more attention could have been paid to previous interpretations, particularly the thesis of Charles A. Beard, but judged from the standpoint of the amassment and criticism of evidence this book is indeed an excellent contribution to historical literature.

In this work Dr. Main addresses himself to some of the most puzzling questions surrounding the adoption of the United States Constitution. A general inquiry would naturally be: Along what geographic, economic, political, and social lines did divisions of opinion on the Constitution's ratification occur? He is interested in all aspects of this question, but more specifically he has confined himself to that body of opinion in opposition to ratification known as Antifederalism. Of course, this cannot be treated in isolation from Federalist thought, but the latter is discussed only in sufficient scope and intensity to make the Antifederalist view understandable, and to avoid what would otherwise be a contest with shadows. Precisely then, what was the essential nature of Antifederalism, its motivations, philosophy and antecedents?

The methodology used to answer these questions is perhaps best expressed in this statement: "The struggle over the Constitution was in part a continuation of a long history of social conflicts which extended far back into colonial times." Although rightly stating that Antifederalism *per se* began with the appearance of the Constitution and ended with its ratification, Main's conviction that the chief historical supporters of Antifederalism were the rural, democratically inclined people who favored a weak central government demanded, on his part, an examination of its antecedents. After reading his report the conclusion is inescapable that however chronologically brief Antifederalism was, in its fruition, or summary period, it reflected an evolutionary development of fundamental significance in eighteenth-century concepts of republican government.

Eschewing a full investigation of the colonial factors that, in a generic sense, preceded Antifederal thought, Main nonetheless makes it clear that they formed part of its heritage. But more immediately pertinent are their manifestations as they emerge from the Revolution, assume more definite shape in the mid-1780's, and take a direction which conditions the frictions of the ratification period. The issues are concerned in part with class structures, debtor-creditor relationships, paper money, and the source and exercise of governmental power. Convinced that the United States was composed of sections, "each with a distinctive social structure, economy, and set of political objectives," Main examines sectional patterns in all the states to ascertain opinion divisions on the prevailing issues. His conclusion is that political behavior within the states is best understood in terms of sectional division. He finds examples of the classic East-West split, but this is not uniformly present, nor, in several cases, is it the most significant pattern of separation. Essentially, political divisions occurred in most of the states, where Antifederalism would be strong, between the commercial

and non-commercial interests. The commercially minded people were found in the towns and among the farmers who were so located as to use transportation facilities (usually waterways) as outlets for their surplus produce. The non-commercial folk were the farmers who could not get their surplus products to good markets, if indeed they had any surplus to sell. It was in the non-commercial rural sections, where the "middling sort" predominated, that Antifederalism would find its principal support.

Having found that political groupings were largely determined within the states along the lines of material interests, Main then measures sectional and state reactions to broad federal issues with the same yardstick. The general questions that disturbed the country during the Confederation revolved around the pressing federal debt and the power of taxation. These were brought into sharp focus when Congress proposed that it be given authority to collect an impost. The proposal aroused many farmers, of course, but out of fear that the impost would permit an undue centralization of power they opposed it more on political than on economic grounds. The states regarded the possible effects of the impost with respect to their individual circumstance, but, generally speaking, political considerations outweighed those of an economic nature.

Arguments over the impost, centering as they did around the location of governmental power, served as a prelude to the main debate on that vital question when the Constitution reached the public. In four excellent chapters the author carefully describes the Antifederal objections to the Constitution and the abortive efforts made to prevent ratification. Congress, the Antifederalists believed, had been given so much power over taxation, military affairs, the judiciary, and the states, that individual liberties were endangered. They were sincere and active in their protests, and although they outnumbered their opponents, they failed. The reasons: their admission that some changes were necessary in the Articles of Confederation, the newspapers, early ratification by several states, and superior Federalist organization and leadership.

Historical explanations for the motivations prompting those individuals and groups who opposed or supported ratification have been numerous. It has been suggested that opinion cleavages occurred along the lines of age, religion, sectionalism and class. Discarding the first two as invalid Main concedes that the latter two have some merit, but at best they provide only partial answers. In his view the available evidence leads to the major generalization "that the struggle over the ratification of the Constitution was primarily a contest between the commercial and the non-commercial elements in the population. This is the most significant fact, to which all else is elaboration, amplification, or exception." In general, the commercial interests were Federal, and the non-commercial interests, with a few exceptions, were Antifederal. That is his theme. Argued convincingly and well buttressed with facts it constitutes a new point of departure in the historiography of the ratification of the United States Constitution.

Letters of a Civil War Surgeon. Edited by Paul Fatout. (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Studies, 1961. Pp. 110. Paperback, \$2.25.)

These well selected letters of Major William Watson, Surgeon, 105th Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteers, have many unusual features. Not the least of these is the son-to-father frankness in disclosure of glaring defects in the Union army's leadership during three full years. Major Watson, being a strong Union sympathizer, although a citizen of borderline Bedford County in which the "Secesh" feeling was predominant, speaks with unbiased judgment.

It is surprising that Major Watson in writing to his father, also a practicing physician, made so few references to actual medical, surgical or sanitary procedures in campaign, camp or actual battle. The fact that he spent comparatively little time in hospital work makes the paucity of technical material in the letters written during this period of service entirely understandable. From the context, it would seem obvious that his superior officers felt much impressed with his efficiency, and that his subordinates had the utmost personal confidence in and affection for him. The fact that the sick rate in his regiment remained low throughout the entire period of his service in it is testimony of his medical skill and executive ability under the most trying conditions.

The text of many of these letters clarifies a considerable number of controversial points, one of them the over-cautious leadership of McClellan, which taxed the patience of Lincoln beyond measure. Also, the text seems to corroborate the opinions of a considerable number of Civil War analysts that Burnside was deliberately hamstrung and hog-tied at critical moments by the vicious and unwarranted jealousy of many of his former Regular Army colleagues. Major Watson frankly recognizes Burnside's limitations, but he points out his honesty, integrity and devotion to the men he led. That this was reciprocated, is clearly evident in *The Story of the 48th*, by Joseph Gould, and *The 48th in the War*, by Oliver Christian Bosbyshell, as well as in many personal letters which have come to this reviewer's attention.

The Watson letters are a most valuable contribution to Civil War literature. They present an educated and refined soldier's viewpoint of political and governmental crises in one of the most critical periods of American history. Paul Fatout deserves credit for his discriminating and sympathetic editing.

West Chester, Pa.

HENRY PLEASANTS, JR.

Tintypes in Oil. By Ernest C. Miller. (Rutland, Vt.: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1961. Pp. 186. \$4.95.)

In this volume a close student and leading bibliophile of early oildom presents a lively miscellany of nine essays on personalities associated with the first oil region. If no basic new interpretations arise from wide ranging and skillfully conducted bibliographic excursions around a relatively small axis, numerous extensions or clarifications of information, mainly biographical, do result.

The author does not entirely escape a difficulty with an approach to social history exclusively through profiles of diversified personalities: that of making readily apparent a meaningful synthesis. In the absence of an explanatory preface or its equivalent, one cannot be certain of his objectives or what principles guided his selections of subjects. To what extent were selections determined merely by the accumulation of fresh evidence on some point, sometimes already well established, as in an essay on Gib Morgan, the region's teller of tall tales whose historicity has previously been removed from doubt? Were selections guided by the thrill of a scholarly detective pursuit, as is expressly stated in the account of Ben Hogan, prize fighter and notorious vice-monger? Permeating all of the essays in varying degrees, such considerations are more apparent than what must have been the governing ones.

At least three of the essays come off exceptionally well. Social historians of religious and cultural attitudes on mining and other frontiers might profitably consult the account of the establishment of the Methodist Church and schooling facilities at Pithole by Reverend Darius S. Steadman. In another essay illuminating with equal success the brief cycles of oil fields, the author wisely shifts the scene from Pithole to the later Cherry Grove field when such economic institutions as oil exchanges and organized oil scouting had matured. His profile of Congressman Charles Vernon Culver, the region's first banker, places in needed focus an area of entrepreneurial activities too often neglected or subordinated in petroleum chronicles and histories.

On the other hand, the familiar stories of Coal Oil Johnny Steele, Ben Hogan, and John Wilkes Booth, Lincoln's assassin, gain little in these retellings. The thesis that Booth might not have shot Lincoln had he succeeded in his oil ventures seems artless and irrelevant. In "He Told the Tales," the author makes perhaps the best possible case for the elevation of oildom's Gib Morgan to the front ranks of purveyors of the frontier humor of exaggeration and boastfulness. Through no fault of Gib's or the author's, a negative vote must here be cast. Unlike Mike Fink, "King of the Keel-boaters," a generation or so earlier, Gib never benefited from early and wide printings of his tales in forms close to the oral tradition, with all the racy spontaneity accruing thereto, nor did he enter balladry extensively as did the fabulous John Henry of Negro railroad workers. Certainly his tales of boastful exaggeration cannot compare with those of other mining frontiers rendered in vivid dialect with rich local coloration and shrewd psychological insights by Mark Twain and Bret Harte. Nor is there persuasive evidence that he made a fraction of the impact on oil workers that Paul Bunyan's emigration from Canada did in American lumber camps.

"The Mighty Might" clarifies various points in the administration of Henry Rouse's estate. Oildom's first public benefactor, Rouse was killed in the first great flowing well catastrophe. "The Stubborn German" traces over a wide bibliographical range the complicated story of John Benninghoff, victim of oildom's most sensational robbery, and his efforts to bring the robbers to justice. Perhaps the essay's least distinctive feature is correction

in its penultimate paragraph of an informational footnote in a work by this reviewer and a co-author.

Loyola University, Chicago

ARNOLD R. DAUM

Gifford Pinchot. Bull Moose Progressive. By Martin L. Fausold. (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1961. Pp. 270. \$4.50.)

This most recent volume in the Men and Movements Series of Syracuse University Press is the second book about Gifford Pinchot to appear in the last two years. The first, M. Nelson McGeary's *Gifford Pinchot, Forester-Politician* (Princeton University Press, 1960), was a full-scale biography, while the present volume is primarily concerned with Pinchot's role as "a principal leader of the radical faction" of the Progressive insurgents from 1910 to 1917.

Professor Fausold believes that "no American represented the total 1901-17 span of the progressive movement as well as did Gifford Pinchot." Furthermore, he is convinced that the onetime Chief Forester was an important influence on Theodore Roosevelt, the Progressive Party and its program, and generally, "the vital processes of the national life." In support of this view, the author describes, briefly, Pinchot's defense of scientific conservation policies in the famous controversy with Interior Secretary Ballinger. He also emphasizes Pinchot's part in the writing of Roosevelt's Osawatomic speech ("the most radical speech of any former President"), the founding of the National Progressive Republican League in 1911, and the organization of the Progressive Party in 1912. The last half of the book is devoted to Pinchot's efforts to maintain the National Progressive Party and its Pennsylvania counterpart, the Washington Party, in 1913; his unsuccessful campaign in Pennsylvania as the Washington Party's candidate for the United States Senate against Boies Penrose in 1914; his fight for a more radical progressive program, and the survival of the Progressive Party during 1915-16.

This study of Pinchot makes two useful contributions. First, it brings into focus the thought and activity of an outstanding American and Pennsylvanian during a time when he has been largely ignored between the Ballinger episode and his election as Governor of Pennsylvania in 1922. Although Pinchot was naïve at times and might have been more restrained in his proposals if he had held a responsible public office (as he was during his two terms as Governor of Pennsylvania), he was one of the most consistent supporters of the advanced progressive ideas of the times. Even though he was never as radical as his brother Amos, who advocated government ownership of certain businesses, Gifford's stand for more positive government planning placed him ahead of his times and foreshadowed the New Deal and the Fair Deal of the 1930's and 1940's. In the second place, by detailing Pinchot's involvement in the Pennsylvania progressive organization, the author makes an important contribution to Pennsylvania political history. The story of the development of the Washington Party and its

efforts to combat the Penrose machine is by no means complete, but it is given its first significant published recounting here.

The most serious criticism of this work is that the author has ignored probably the most tantalizing question for historians of the Progressive Era, *i.e.*, why were certain individuals Progressives? In Pinchot's case, what conditions or circumstances prompted him to become a reformer and a leader of the radical Progressives? His interest in conservation and friendship for Roosevelt were important but do not adequately explain his motivation. Perhaps a satisfactory explanation is impossible; nevertheless, the author should have made a more thorough investigation of this problem since it is one of the keys to understanding the whole Progressive Era.

The author could have made more extensive use of other manuscript sources, instead of relying almost exclusively on the Gifford and Amos Pinchot papers; he includes too many lengthy quotations where summaries would have served the same purpose and added to the readability of the book. A work of this sort should have specific footnoting instead of summary source paragraphs in the back. Also, the text contains a number of factual errors; for example, a reform mayor was elected in Philadelphia in 1911 not 1910; William H. Berry was not State Treasurer when he ran for Governor in 1910; Matthew Quay—not Boies Penrose—made Samuel W. Pennypacker Governor of Pennsylvania in 1902.

In brief, this interesting and valuable discussion of Pinchot's Bull Moose years would have been enhanced by a more penetrating analysis of the man and his motives.

Beaver College

LLOYD M. ABERNETHY