
In choosing for his subject William Penn's "holy experiment," Professor Bronner has selected an intriguing topic for a book. Model colonies and settlements have been founded by many reformers and philanthropists. Most of them were short-lived and ended in failure and oblivion. As a "holy experiment" the author believes Pennsylvania also failed since it never was able to surmount human frailties sufficiently to make it possible to have the kind of society envisioned by the great Quaker humanitarian.

There were many reasons why Penn's experiment failed. Neither he nor the Quakers who settled Pennsylvania were able to sustain their idealism in the face of pressures arising from circumstances surrounding the founding of the colony. All felt compelled to compromise their beliefs and principles from time to time as one dilemma after another arose from the clash of Quakerism with the realities of life.

Most of the book is devoted to the political turmoil which haunted Pennsylvania during its early days. It was, according to the author, the political controversies, so contrary to Quaker ideals, that caused the primary breakdown of the "holy experiment." For this unfortunate turn of events Penn must share the blame, because the trouble arose initially from his insistence upon the collection of the quit rents. Sometimes, it would appear from the author's interpretation, the failure of the "holy experiment" is reducible simply to Penn's inability to collect his dues. Though he is at times quite critical of Penn, he does attempt to defend the proprietor's position; however, he does not give much space to presenting the people's side of the controversy.

Few will take exception to the generalization that the "holy experiment" was not a total failure regardless of its shortcomings. However, the illustrations offered as the "fruits" of the experiment leave something to be desired. In comparison to neighboring colonies, Pennsylvania was not a failure, the author states. What is meant by this is not explained. After 1690 Pennsylvania enjoyed considerable prosperity. This is made clear by a discussion of the economic life of the colony. Other colonies, however, it could be shown, enjoyed a similar period of prosperity. If Pennsylvania was any better off because of the "holy experiment," little evidence is supplied to support this contention.

No doubt Pennsylvania's liberal frame of government of 1701 owed some-
thing to Quaker doctrine. Nonetheless, the Pennsylvania government was no more liberal than that in some of the other colonies not influenced by Quakerism. The government of New Jersey under the Concessions granted by Berkeley and Carteret nearly twenty years prior to the founding of Pennsylvania is a case in point.

Although the Quakers are to be commended for their religious toleration, by the time of William Penn this was not unique on the part of the Quakers. The Concessions, mentioned above, provided "that noe person qualified as aforesaid within the said Province at any time shall be any waies molested, punished, disquieted or called in Question for any difference in opinion or practice in matters of Religious concernments—." Furthermore, it may be that the larger number of immigrants settling in Pennsylvania than in a place such as East New Jersey was not because of greater political and religious freedom but because of the availability of an abundance of cheap land.

Although Professor Bronner does not dwell on the matter of Pennsylvania's Indian relations, he credits the long peace with the Indians to the spirit of brotherly love generated by the "holy experiment." However that may be, East New Jersey, settled by Puritans, also shared the peace with these same Indians or their kinsmen. Neither was Penn's buying the land from the Indians unique. Englishmen in all the colonies had begun purchasing land from the Indians long before Pennsylvania was settled. In assessing the fruits of the "holy experiment," the author appears to be on firmer ground when he discusses Quaker opposition to slavery and capital punishment. Pennsylvania in the eighteenth century was undoubtedly a leader in these reforms.

In conclusion, it may be said this book's principal contribution is the light it throws on the political history of Pennsylvania during the first twenty years of its existence, a period that has not yet been given careful study by historians. Overly detailed and too meticulous coverage of minor events as well as of some major issues, however, does not make the work easy reading. Consequently, it may have a limited appeal for persons other than students of Quaker history.

Rutgers University

THEODORE THAYER

_Puritans and Yankees: The Winthrop Dynasty of New England, 1630-1717._


The historian of seventeenth-century Puritanism in New England had better be endowed with a keen sense for irony, preferably of the kind Dr. Johnson defined as the source of Wit, "a kind of discordia concors; a combination of dissimilar images, or discovery of occult resemblances in things apparently unlike."

Nothing, on the surface, would appear more dissimilar than the images of Puritan and Yankee in the history of the American character, yet an occult resemblance between the two has provided endless fascination for
the historian inquiring after continuity. In quest of it, but lacking such
wit, we may follow either the "filio-pietistic school of New England
eulogy," as it has been called, or be tempted into caricature, the luxury of
those outraged by Puritan hypocrisy. Mr. Dunn avoids both extremes. He
is properly endowed.

From an opening judgment of the senior John Winthrop ("The only
exceptional aspect of Winthrop's early life was his Puritanism.") which
I take to be a calculated understatement, to the book's final sentence, a
pronouncement upon Fitz Winthrop ("If he began an ersatz Cavalier, he
ended a genuine Yankee.") to the assembled portraits of four Winthrops
on the title page (based on Mr. Dunn's drawings), Mr. Dunn's modulated
irony quietly underscores the resemblance within the surface disparities.
New Yankee was but Old Puritan, albeit writ small.

The narrative is divided into three parts, one for each Winthrop genera-
tion: John Winthrop (1588-1649); John Winthrop, Jr. (1606-1676); and
the latter's sons, "two Cavaliers in Israel," Fitz John Winthrop (1638-
1707) and Wait Winthrop (1642-1717). The latter two, having received the
slimmest treatment by historians to date, properly occupy nearly half the
book. Their joint portrait, in fact, carries the burden of Mr. Dunn's thesis,
in that the contrasts with father and grandfather are most marked: where
the elder Winthrops were first and foremost public men, steadfastly
moral and self-conscious instruments of God's purpose, the brothers Fitz
and Wait "betrayed a fundamental moral confusion," expressed by both
men in careers of exasperating selfishness which made their private interests
(chiefly the accumulation of real estate) govern their public conduct. The
irony of their careers is also one of the central ironies of New England
history, and the author neatly pins it down: "Despite their preoccupation
with private interest, they proved to be better guardians of New England's
chartered liberties than of their own family fortune." From such ironies can
theories of providential history grow.

Mr. Dunn's history, however, rests solidly on a detailed recital of the
involvement of each Winthrop in colonial politics, especially as these were
muddied by sudden changes in the home government in England with ac-
companying changes in colonial policy. In this sense, Mr. Dunn has re-
written a familiar chapter in colonial political history, though with a fresh
look at the original sources, and with the intent of showing how this
political experience, both at home and with England and the King's agents,
contributed to an emerging American character.

A lesser but related motif echoes from his account of the changing
attitudes of each Winthrop towards the home country. The first John
Winthrop's policy of "splendid isolation" offered a "Modell of Christian
Charity" to inspire by example the regeneration of English society. John
Winthrop, Jr., studiously cultivated and maintained intellectual and cultural
ties with the homeland, and guided Connecticut's affairs on the principle
that cooperation with the homeland better assured New England's liberty
and prosperity than did defiance. Without abandoning his father's religious
values, he had come to feel, Mr. Dunn maintains, "that man cannot live
The brothers Fitz and Wait, on the other hand, started by resenting their isolation and provincialism. They cultivated the ways of Englishmen and the favor of the King and the King’s agents. Wait learned to play “a double game,” keeping on good terms with Massachusetts’ royal governor, Joseph Dudley, while encouraging his friend Sir Henry Ashurst to work against Dudley in England. Wait, whose son John married Dudley’s daughter Anne, “ended his days as Governor Dudley’s creature in the brave new world of place, interest, and connection.” Fitz, whose public career as Governor of Connecticut was more energetic than his brother’s public involvement, learned “what his grandfather and father had never had to learn, that in England he was an outsider.” He discovered, as Mr. Dunn puts it, “his true native identity,” recognizing himself as a New Englander, a Yankee.

In these shifting relationships we have nearly the whole spectrum of later American attitudes towards that “sense of Europe” which has played so large a role in the American quest for identity. Having to reconcile the conflicting claims upon his loyalties and interests, whether in matters of church policy and dogma, or to preserve and extend private fortunes in real estate, the New England colonial leader could neither ignore nor defy the forces in Europe. He had to come to terms with them. Typically, as Mr. Dunn has shown with the Winthrops, he arrived at a solution involving “a mixture of business and idealism, shrewdness and humanity.” His faith in his role of Englishman was shaken. He asserted his own identity.

Mr. Dunn has done much more, including emphasizing John Winthrop Jr.'s pioneering role as an early American industrialist and scientist, thus skillfully suggesting how economic and intellectual impulses operate in political history, for Winthrop’s reputation in these areas contributed much to his successful attainment in 1662 of the Connecticut charter from Charles II. He has also rendered a lively account of the military adventures and misadventures of New Englanders as they sought to meet or avoid their obligations to the home country’s imperialistic ambitions. But his real contribution lies in his detailed demonstration of how Englishmen learned they were becoming Americans.

Lafayette College

J. R. Vitelli


Long considered a classic in the broad field of Pennsylvania German letters, Henry C. Mercer’s The Bible In Iron receives added stature through this third edition. All of the distinction of the earlier editions has been preserved, and Mr. Sandford, the editor of this edition, has immeasurably enhanced its value by his own “further amendments and additions.”

The area of interest embraced by this study was originally identified as
“the decorated stove plates of the Pennsylvania Germans,” but the title page of The Bible In Iron is a bit more specific: “Pictured Stoves and Stoveplates of the Pennsylvania Germans: Notes on Colonial Firebacks in the United States, the Ten-plate Stove, Franklin’s Fireplace and the Tile Stoves of the Moravians in Pennsylvania and North Carolina, together with a List of Colonial Furnaces in the United States and Canada.” The Bible In Iron is all of this and much more.

There are, for example, more than 400 photographs of stoves, stoveplates and related artifacts, all grouped together in one section and intelligently arranged so that the development of techniques and designs is readily apparent. There is also an excellent commentary on the development of stove decoration in Europe. An exhaustive effort is made to explain the mystique of the symbolism found on stove plates. There are also approximately 85 pages of text containing detailed descriptions of the 409 illustrations. A fresh chapter on “The Anglo-American Fireback” is contributed by Mr. Sandford. There are textual notes, a bibliography, an index, and all of the other scholarly apparatus characteristic of a definite study.

The physical aspects of this third edition are splendid—it looks good, it “holds” well, and it reads interestingly. Internally, the prefatory comment indicates that it differs from its predecessors in these respects:

The text has been consolidated and is no longer impeded by islands of pictures and picture commentary. Stove-plate pictures are grouped more closely according to style and for better comparison. Picture descriptions are now in a separate section, and material on iron-masters and furnaces, formerly under pictures, is now in the appended furnace notes. Corrections replace erroneous statements. There is an added chapter on Biblical stove-plates with especial attention to the floral pattern plates, their symbols and their designer. The meaning of several secular plates, hitherto obscure or unknown, has been determined. There is also a new chapter on firebacks, both English and American.

This remarkable book is a logical extension of a remarkable collection of stoves and stoveplates housed in the Bucks County Historical Society’s Mercer Museum in Doylestown. This collection has received a great deal of effort and attention for more than sixty years and it stands as a happy handmaiden to this book. If you approach this area of interest by viewing the collection, you will certainly want to have the book, and if you begin with the book, by all means arrange to visit the museum.

Schwenkfelder Library

Andrew S. Berky


The ethnic interpretation of colonial history has certain deficiencies, and the trite story that Pennsylvania was settled by the Quakers, the Pennsylvania Dutch, and the Scotch-Irish is no exception. Inevitably studies of individual groups tend to lack balance, and however good the authors'
intentions, they leave an aftertaste of smug Quaker, peasant German, and boastful Scotch-Irish. Let it be said immediately, therefore, that Dr. Leyburn is cool to eulogies stemming from the Scotch-Irish Society and does not subscribe to any theories of national character or inherent superiority.

The body of the present book is divided into three sections: Part I (77 pages) concerns itself with the Scottish background of the Ulster settlers; Part II (71 pages) deals with the Ulster settlements themselves; and Part III (169 pages) is devoted to the Scotch-Irish in America. Appendices discuss the name "Scotch-Irish" and supply a list of dates in Scottish history. Explanatory notes are placed at the foot of the pages, mere citations are relegated to the back of the book. The 18-page bibliography follows the tripartite division of the text but does not separate manuscript, published sources, and secondary works. The 5-page index is less than exhaustive.

A volume on the Scotch-Irish is of particular interest to Pennsylvanians. Some Scotch-Irish settled elsewhere, but their great eighteenth-century immigration was to Pennsylvania, from whose frontier many Scotch-Irish and Germans participated in a movement that peopled the back country of the Carolinas before previous settlements there had advanced far from the coast.

Such a study as the present one must rely largely on secondary works, so that much depends upon the author's good judgment. Dr. Leyburn's judgment seems generally good; and though sober and sensible, he is not afraid to question accepted notions. He does not fall into error by equating Presbyterian and Scotch-Irish; he doubts that the Presbyterian church contributed much to American democracy, and suspects that the debt may be the other way round; he recognizes the Scotch-Irish contribution in politics, religion, and education, but notes the lack of any in aesthetics. He agrees that in the Revolution the Scotch-Irish were, unlike the Scots settlers, very generally on the side of independence, but he does not think the Scotch-Irish remained a distinctive group long after that war.

No one's judgment is infallible, and readers, especially if Scotch-Irish, may feel inclined to argue a point or two. Cromwell's position in Irish demonology is doubtless secure, but isn't it a bit unfair to liken him to Genghis Khan? How much can be said with assurance of the Mecklenburg Declaration? Was it witchcraft or punishment for witchcraft that was abolished in 1727? Are the effects of the fall of Fort Duquesne overrated?

Inevitably, the author's guides have sometimes failed him, especially in marginal and minor matters. The Britons, one reads, pushed the Gaels into Scotland and Wales; surely, rather, into Ireland. Other minor lapses may be similar or mere slips of the pen. When the author says that Scottish trade abroad was "chiefly with the Lowlands," he must mean the Low Countries. Pennsylvania's Provincial Council did not disappear in 1701, and the course of Braddock's road is inaccurately portrayed. Enniskillen is not "in the northernmost parts of Ulster."

A repeated error appears in dating the French and Indian War. Dr. Leyburn has Fort Duquesne built "near Pittsburgh" in 1753 and has Indians attacking Pennsylvania settlements in 1754 or even 1753, although
the first such attack was actually on October 16, 1755, more than three months after Braddock’s defeat. This error might be merely annoying were it not for the author’s subsequent assertion that in consequence of Indian attacks the Scotch-Irish “immediately began an agitation” that persuaded Governor Robert Hunter Morris to defy the reluctant Assembly and declare war on the Indians (actually on April 14, 1756). In fact Morris had taken some defensive measures immediately after Braddock’s defeat and needed no Scotch-Irish encouragement to oppose the Assembly.

Doubtless most of these matters are marginal, minor annoyances like ants at a picnic. The author disclaims, moreover, the intentions of writing anything more than a social history. This will not do, however. Dr. Leyburn has written a lively, interesting, sensible, and convenient history of the Scotch-Irish; it is not a merely social history, probably could not be, and certainly will not be read as such. But whether the book be general or restricted in scope, accuracy in detail is desirable as well as general soundness. It is customary in such cases to express the hope that imperfections will be corrected in the next edition; in the present instance the usefulness and merits of the volume give added voice to the wish.

*Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission*

WILLIAM A. HUNTER


Devotees of eighteenth-century history may be fascinated by this dissection of John Wilkes, for Wilkes has a special place in Pennsylvania annals—his name is perpetuated in the city of Wilkes-Barre. Since he spoke for the colonies in Parliament he became a minor hero on this side of the Atlantic, but at home he was a political adventurer, hated by the Ministry and frequently embarrassing to his own supporters, especially Lord Temple, who at one time was his chief financial backer.

Wilkes, however, was a symbol of the social discontent of his time. Rude does a diligent, and indeed distinguished job of proving this by the Namier method. The late Sir Lewis Namier was a pioneer in “proving” history by minute examination of tax rolls, voting lists, Parliamentary divisions, etc. That method has been criticized as an approach to biography, for a man may be far more than the sum of provable records; but in the case of Wilkes it is just such data which are significant.

Wilkes’s private life was frequently scandalous and generally unimportant. Rude emphasizes that he is not writing a biography. Contrariwise, he proves that Wilkes was the instrument of various elements who sought a voice of protest in the changing society of the latter part of the eighteenth century. For Americans it is interesting to note that Wilkes’s espousal of the colonial cause was a mere incident in his attacks on the Ministry and had little relation to the persecution visited upon him.

Briefly, Wilkes was a man of moderate wealth and minor social position who had a towering ambition to be a person of consequence. He had audacity and an extraordinary gift of gab. A seat in Parliament would be the logical
platform for his talents and he ran successfully for such a seat, but was declared ineligible. This thrust him into the limelight he sought.

If George III and his ministers had ignored the man he might be unknown today; but stupidly the Court party tried to crush Wilkes. He ran repeatedly for Parliament, repeatedly was rejected, but finally was seated. Ultimately, indeed, he became Lord Mayor of London, a symbol of the City's resentment of the power of the Court. He was also a popular hero because he had been convicted of publishing a magazine, The North Briton, which had viciously ridiculed certain members of the Ministry. For this he had been exiled for several years.

Now why was Wilkes a hero? Rude shows that the man's voting support came not alone from the City and its influential guilds, but also from minor tradesmen and small manufacturers in the suburbs, from underpaid workers, and even from some wealthy men such as Lord Temple, who were out of favor at Court.

Wilkes, however, was not a consistent reformer. In his latter years he accepted a sinecure, became a friend of the King, and even went so far as to declare, "I never was a Wilkite."

Rude's book is indispensable for anyone working in the period; his appendices especially are impressive.

Princeton, N. J. 

J. C. Long


The many admirers of Alexander Hamilton gain powerful advocacy from this second and last volume of Broadus Mitchell's biography. Although nearly the last fruit of the Hamilton bicentennial season (many more volumes of the Syrett and Cooke edition of Hamilton's papers are yet to come), it is perhaps the most flavorful. As fully researched and packed with measured interpretations as the first one, the present volume completes a portrait of Hamilton that lays potent claim to being the best that has been done so far. The secretary's critics will be anguished, but they pit themselves against an immensely spirited and knowing protagonist in Professor Mitchell.

That nationalism was the compelling theme in Hamilton's career is readily acknowledged by historians; what specially marks this biography is a persuasive precision in describing this theme as it applied particularly to Hamilton. The critical factor, according to Professor Mitchell, was Hamilton's belief that a nation was not truly a nation unless its members acted together. It was not enough to share common values. Thus again and again the reader comes across passages like these: "This theme of association or cooperation ran through Hamilton's recommendations, because we were deficient in organization... Wealth was social coordination, self-discipline of a people," and, "He was a public man in two senses, for he believed that the engine of improvement was organized effort. Progress
for him began in social resolve, in what he called the community’s will. . . . While he lived he was possessed by the passion for association.” Political parties arose in the 1790’s, argues Professor Mitchell, between “believers in the cautiously positive and the recklessly restrictive. Both contenders meant that the citizen should be free and flourish. To this end, one group saw the need for action. The instinct and counsel of the other was suspicion and reservation.”

Although he is gentle about it, there is little question that Professor Mitchell sees few virtues in the age of individualism, passive government, and private enterprise (on this last point he is at pains to dispute Louis Hacker’s view that Hamilton made government planning subordinate to the encouragement of capitalism). It pleases him that Americans in mid-twentieth century have come to see once more that “the security of the individual is in the security of the mass.” Even without respect to the merit of nineteenth-century American values and practices, however, Professor Mitchell argues strongly that they were viable only because Alexander Hamilton and his supporters had soundly established national sovereignty, fiscal solvency, and the principle of implied powers in the Constitution. In an intensely practical way, Hamilton understood the peculiar needs of the new nation and found the wherewithal to meet them. His greatest service to the country, Professor Mitchell holds, was in the loftiest political realm. Though of value in themselves, Hamilton’s economic devices were principally means to a higher end.

If these are the large outlines, Professor Mitchell does not neglect the traditional controversies that have swirled around Hamilton’s head. With very few exceptions he provides a militant and striking defense. The funding and assumption proposals were brilliantly correct. Madison becomes on this issue the “defender of mistaken policy,” and Jefferson “yielded to the temptation to . . . fix a fraud upon Hamilton” when he claimed that he had been duped on the Washington-assumption bargain. Professor Mitchell vigorously disputes Samuel F. Bemis’s charge that Hamilton compromised our negotiations with the British in 1792 through conversations with Minister George Hammond. He finds that the evidence “fails to support the insinuation” that Hamilton exaggerated the Whiskey Rebellion in order to display federal military might. Moving on to the French crisis, Professor Mitchell asserts that Hamilton never took seriously Francisco de Miranda’s schemes, and, more importantly, that Hamilton’s purpose in supporting a larger army was solely for defense and not for domestic political reasons. Lastly, in words that bristle with scorn, Hamilton is defended against the charge that he was not an “American.”

The list of Hamilton’s defects is not a long one in this biography. He was a trifle too loyal to friends (the William Duer matter); he indulged too readily in low-level newspaper attacks; and he interfered overmuch in Adams’s cabinet. The one crucial error was the violent attack upon John Adams in 1800, an attack that went far to crack the Federalist party. Professor Mitchell attributes this “glaring inconsistency” to weary exasperation and a certain lack of skill as a popular political leader. This last matter
is a provocative one. According to Professor Mitchell, Hamilton was too busy during his lifetime to cultivate the art of democratic politics. "He regretted at the last," Mitchell writes, "that the Federalists had not had time to cultivate democratic preferences." In another place he agrees that without Republican objections the Federalists would have pushed their programs too far and "the principle of democracy would have been neglected or overridden."

These are serious charges, especially when Professor Mitchell himself agrees that democracy has been "the signal contribution of the United States." Yet only rarely does he acknowledge that the principal thrust of contemporary objections to Hamilton's manner and program was on just this ground. Many Americans were thoroughly aware in the 1790's that a nation could be rich and powerful at the expense of democracy and individual sovereignty. Because the story came out all right—the Jeffersonians won and America became both rich and democratic—Professor Mitchell is content, but he has probably not entirely allayed the fundamental unease that many bring to their study of the fascinating and brilliant figure of Alexander Hamilton.

*Princeton University*  
*SHAW LIVERMORE, JR.*


The writing of the history of a city like Washington presents difficulties that are almost insuperable, for the historian must picture the development of the capital against the background of the nation as a whole, and it is hard to keep the account of the city from mushrooming into a narrative of national events. Mrs. Green has succeeded in keeping her description of Washington's origin and development within bounds, and she has given a carefully documented chronological narrative of the capital's growth. She has not been able to do this without omitting important matters, and her own statement of purpose should be remembered in reading her work: "This book is not in any true sense a definitive history. Some problems I have ignored altogether and some examined only superficially. Church history, court dockets, land records, and successive occupants of historic houses have received short shrift; architectural developments net attention only insofar as they marked a change in public interest in the capital. . . . The result may be called an interpretive rather than a comprehensive, fool-proof history." Within the framework that she has outlined for herself, Mrs. Green provides an account that will be useful to future historians who will bless her for giving the documentation that will enable them to go back to sources for further information on topics that Mrs. Green mentions only in passing.

The omission that many readers will perhaps regret most is the elimination of architectural history. In a monumental city like Washington, architecture is of paramount importance and interest. A reader can pick up here and there in the narrative some suggestions about changing tastes,
but there is nowhere a discussion of the architectural transitions that Washington has seen, from L'Enfant's ambitious design to the atrocities that marked the post-Civil War period in building.

The structure of Mrs. Green's history makes it difficult for the reader to gain any unified conception of institutional developments in Washington. For example, education and schools are mentioned when problems concerning them crop up in the chronological narrative, but even recourse to the index does not enable a reader to put together a coherent account of schools, colleges, and cultural institutions. One wishes that Mrs. Green could have contrived some topical concentration within chronological divisions to avoid a narrative that runs on from year to year without giving the reader much help in organizing his thoughts about any particular subject. Mrs. Green's personal interests, as may be proper, predominate in the themes treated. For instance, race relations occupy an inordinate amount of space in every section, and one wonders whether Washington's race problems were sufficiently different from those in the rest of the country to warrant so much attention to this theme at the expense of space which might have been devoted to other equally important topics.

The founding of Washington marked an extraordinary event in municipal history. With the examples of Australia and Brazil before us, the decision to create a capital city de novo does not seem strange to us, but it was a revolutionary idea at the end of the eighteenth century. Most Americans are familiar with the story of the "bargain" that Hamilton made with the Virginia delegation to locate the federal district on the Potomac between Virginia and Maryland. Later observers have often commented on the unwholesome site—on the hazards to health of the swamps of Foggy Bottom, the present location of the State Department. But Mrs. Green makes the point that when the site was chosen, when the area was all well-wooded and green, it was neither so hot nor so miasmic as it later became.

The evolution, however, from raw patches of woods and meadows into a national capital was a slow and painful process. Foreigners who came to the "Federal City," as Washington was first called, found life hard and wrote of their unhappiness. It took nearly seventy-five years for Washington to solve such elementary problems as sewage disposal and an adequate water supply. The present Constitution Avenue was a noisome canal until after the Civil War; into this stinking ditch butchers dumped offal and collectors of garbage tipped their carts. The effluvia was wafted up the hill to the White House, but little was done about it until the 1870's, when sewers were installed and the stagnant waterway was filled. Even to this day, the sewage-laden Potomac is an affront to a civilized community, and the reader of Mrs. Green's history will be constantly aware that many of the problems that she discusses are still pertinent in the life of the capital.

A persistent theme in this history is the dream of commercial and industrial development that businessmen and speculators refused to give up. Not until recent years has Washington come to realize that being the center of the national government provides "industry" enough, and even
yet the Board of Trade is constantly hoping to attract business to the city. In the early days, hope lay in the development of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, which, its promoters believed, would eventually funnel products from the West to ocean-going vessels on the Potomac. But trade eluded Washington, and it was left for Big Government to insure its prosperity.

Mrs. Green has performed a useful service to scholars in providing a great deal of factual information about the growth of the capital through its most difficult period. She also supplies some charming pictures and a valuable bibliography.

The Folger Library

Louis B. Wright


The appearance of another volume dealing with the Civil War must justify itself through originality, firsthand observations, or importance. The publication of this volume is merited because the writer presents his own comments about battles and everyday life in the Confederate Army, entering as a youth and ending as a man in a military prison.

The young Virginian enlisted under the command of a kinsman in Hanover, Virginia, on May 13, 1861. Following service with a river battery at Jamestown Island and illness from typhoid fever, he had his baptism under fire on the Yorktown-Warwick River line a year later. In addition to participating in the Peninsular Campaign, he also fought at Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, Spotsylvania, and Cold Harbor. During the Shenandoah campaign, at Waynesboro on March 2, 1865, he was captured and sent to Fort Delaware. Signing an oath of allegiance, he returned home on June 24 “four years one month and seven days” after he had enlisted in the Hanover Artillery, to face an uncertain future. From other records we know that he later became a school teacher.

Pennsylvania readers and Civil War buffs will be interested in Berkeley’s vivid description of incidents at Gettysburg. At one time seventy-nine North Carolinians lay dead in a straight line, all killed by one volley of musketry. With emotion he recorded that this was “a sight which was perfectly sickening and heart-rending in the extreme. It would have satiated the most blood-thirsty and cruel man on God’s earth.” Darkness, he thought, was the time best suited to carry on “such bloody and hellish work” as the two armies had been engaged in on July 1 and 2. He expressed sympathy for the wounded on both sides. Although his battery was ordered to be prepared to enter the fighting at a moment’s notice on July 3, it retreated with the remnant of Southern troops on the evening of July 4 without having fired a shot.

Berkeley’s birthday on March 27, 1865, was spent at Fort Delaware under sad and gloomy circumstances. He foresaw the close of the war, as “a great many of our people have seen it, since ill-fated Gettysburg; but they would
not acknowledge it, even to themselves." He expressed doubts that he should even express such thoughts in his diary. He writes vividly about "galvanized Yankees" (Confederate prisoners who joined the Union Army after taking an oath of allegiance), scurvy, and prison conditions, though his treatment does not compare in length and polish with W. K. Handy's *U. S. Bonds, or Duress by Federal Authority*, a clergyman's account of prison life at Fort Delaware.

The book is well edited, with pictures, notes and an appendix. It adds to our knowledge of what the common soldier felt and experienced during the Civil War, and portions of it are of special interest to Pennsylvanians and Delawareans.

*Otterbein College*

HAROLD B. HANCOCK


Few armies in history have been so unfortunate for so long a time in the quality of their leaders as the famous Army of the Potomac, nor so hamstrung in military freedom of action. Cast in the role of defender of the Northern capital, every one of its commanding generals at one time or another found himself chafing under seemingly restrictive interference from the War Department and the Washington "politicians" in the area of military strategy and even tactics.

The Army of the Potomac deserved a kinder fate. Better armed and equipped, admittedly superior in artillery, more effectively served logistically, always stronger in manpower than its opponent—all it needed to win battles was a top field commander capable of wielding aggressively and efficiently the powerful weapon which McClellan had successfully forged during the first year of the war.

In *Commanders of the Army of the Potomac*, historian Warren W. Hassler has in effect written a capsule history of the Civil War in the East, built around the Union's major striking force, during which a succession of seven Northern generals, on each of whom rested temporarily the hopes of the Union, were catapulted for the most part from obscurity to prominence, almost overnight. The author's narrative of the important campaigns and battles is intentionally subordinated, however, to analyses in depth of the several commanders, for this book is essentially a study in command. Chronologically, from First Bull Run to Appomattox, the author appraises each of the commanding generals from Irvin McDowell to Ulysses S. Grant, examining his talents and idiosyncrasies, his character assets and liabilities, his administrative abilities and field generalship, and the manner in which he handled his relationships with the powers in Washington.

This scholarly, adequately documented work performs a distinct service in presenting in a single volume a condensed but comprehensive appraisal of the six commanders of the Army of the Potomac and the one and only commander of the short-lived Army of Virginia. The author expresses in
his Preface the hope that his study "will be at least an introduction to and a primer for any further, more exhaustive research and writing pertaining to Lincoln's lieutenants in the East." Civil War buffs will echo that sentiment, for the field is a rich one that has been only partly cultivated, the seven army commanders covered being a controversial lot whose personalities and actions are subject to wide variations of opinion.

As one reads (or re-reads) the history of the Army of the Potomac, he must be amazed at the fundamental strength and resilience of an army that was forced to march and fight and die under such relative incompetents in high command as McDowell, John Pope, Ambrose Burnside, and Joseph Hooker. George B. McClellan, George G. Meade, and Grant are all given at least passing grades. Nevertheless, for the four first named one may feel a certain sympathy in view of the fact that the rapidly promoted McDowell was pressured into fighting before he was ready, while Pope, Burnside and Hooker, unequal to their task, simply lacked the necessary character and military capabilities to cope with the ablest general of his age, R. E. Lee, and his first-string team of Thomas J. Jackson, James Longstreet, and J. E. B. Stuart.

This reviewer was curious to see how the author would rate McClellan and Grant, in view of his favorable treatment of the former in *McClellan, Shield of the Union*. Although McClellan's shortcomings are mentioned, the more favorable aspects of his character have been given major prominence, leaving the reader with the impression that he was the outstanding Union general of the war, with Grant a close second but still not "little Mac's" equal.

The author fails to mention or at least minimizes several serious failures on McClellan's part which to the military mind seem rather fundamental, such as his preoccupation with matters of organization, training, and administration at the expense of fighting; his unfortunate use of civilian detectives in place of military intelligence and counter-intelligence personnel; his failure to appreciate the value of cavalry as so successfully exemplified by Stuart and other Confederate horsemen; above all, his exasperating reluctance to engage the enemy and to take prompt advantage of the opportunities offered to exploit the errors of his opponent.

The primary objective in war is to defeat and destroy the enemy, or cause him to surrender. Of the seven army commanders treated, only Grant accomplished that mission. In general, however, Hassler's appraisal is made objectively, competently, and in a very readable style. Students of the Civil War will find it a useful and important work.


In recent years there have been a number of excellent monographs published on various aspects of the history of American labor. Among these
are the studies by William Sullivan and Walter Hugins on workingmen's movements in Pennsylvania and New York City in the Jackson era, by Philip Taft on the American Federation of Labor, by Marc Karson on the AFL in politics, by James O. Morris on the craft-industrial conflict in the AFL, by Irving Bernstein on labor in the 'twenties, by Walter Galenson on the CIO, and by Joel Seidman on labor during the war and reconversion. To this list of well-researched and well-written volumes must now be added Professor Gerald N. Grob's *Workers and Utopia*.

The historical framework of Professor Grob's book is a familiar one: the rise and disintegration of the National Labor Union, the development and decline of the Knights of Labor, the growth of trade unionism and of the American Federation of Labor to 1896. However, the importance of the book does not lie in this framework; rather it lies in his presentation of the ideological conflict that existed within the American labor movement during the years 1865-1896. This conflict Professor Grob defines as one between reform unionism and trade unionism.

Reform unionism had its ideological roots in the Jacksonian labor movement. "Wedded to a democratic philosophy of liberty, equality, individualism, and progress," reform unionists thought that the "primary function of the labor movement was the *restoration* (italics mine) of the independence of the working class." This objective was to be accomplished by creating a society "where all would belong to the producing class, and the individual would combine in his own person both worker and employer functions." While their objective was constant, the methods of reform unionists fluctuated. They could be supporters of producers' cooperatives; they could both favor and oppose political action, depending on their evaluation of its success; they could show favor or hostility to capitalism, depending on whether it was defined in pre- or post-factory terms; they could oppose organization along trade lines and still oppose organization along industrial lines because neither form of organization could solve the "basic difficulties facing the working class."

Trade unionism began to develop in the 1850's. Uninterested in social reform, trade unionists implicitly acknowledged the permanence of capitalism and industrial society; at the same time they "emancipated themselves from the idea that their interests were identical with those of their employers" and accepted the permanence of their status as wage earners. Their objectives (a rising standard of living) and their methods ("development of strong economic organizations to gain recognition and engage successfully in collective bargaining") remained constant.

It was in the National Labor Union that the two ideologies first came into direct conflict. Dominated by men like William H. Sylvis, who was of the opinion "that no permanent reform can ever be established through the agency of the trades-unions," the NLU, nevertheless, was dependent for its existence on trade unionists, who left the organization when reformers gained the upper hand. The same ideological conflict developed within the Knights of Labor between the reform-minded leadership, led by Terence V. Powderly, and the rank and file trade unionists. The chief aim of the re-
farmers was abolition of the "wage system" through education; trade unionists, on the other hand, sought higher wages and shorter hours through economic action—collective bargaining and the strike. To a great degree all quarrels within the Knights were based on this fundamental difference.

The ideological conflict became a little blurred when it came to political action, since reform unionists themselves split into those who wanted to act through major political parties and those who wanted to act independently or in alliance with farmers.

The crucial ideological conflict between the reform unionists and trade unionists, of course, ultimately developed after 1886, when a rupture occurred between the Knights and the national unions who formed the American Federation of Labor. The defeat of the Knights by the trade unions "was undoubtedly one of the most significant events in the history of the American labor movement." It meant the defeat of reformism and the victory of a new form of organization "which more nearly mirrored the emerging American acquisitive industrial society." It meant that workingmen had shifted from reform to a job-and-wage conscious program "that was well adapted to a dynamic and expanding environment." In the nineteenth century trade unionists faced one more dynamic reform movement pressed by the socialists; this, too, they rejected.

Professor Grob has made a significant contribution to the historiography of the American labor movement.
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