BOOK REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTES

EDITED BY NORMAN B. WILKINSON

(Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin for the Department of History, University of Wisconsin, 1963. Pp. 312. $4.75.)

This work is a revision of a University of Wisconsin doctoral dissertation. In his preface the author makes the perceptive remark that if he were to review this book he would "be tempted to observe that it appears to suffer from a split personality." Here he has put his finger on one of the most disturbing elements in the work. Somewhat over half of the narrative deals with Philadelphia's maritime commerce, while the latter part deals primarily with the merchant's role in the events leading to the Revolution. Either part could justify a major study in itself.

Mr. Jensen has divided his book into three sections. The first of these deals in some detail with the origins and development of Philadelphia commerce. Part Two is an analysis in terms of the varied areas of trade: the West Indies, South Europe and the Wine Islands, the coastwise trade, and the British Isles. The third part, in many ways the most important, is primarily concerned with the role of the merchants of Philadelphia in the events of the pre-Revolutionary crisis. Here the author treats the general economic conditions in Philadelphia, illegal trade and customs enforcement, and British policy, as well as the relationship between the merchants and the popular leaders of the city in such specific events as the Stamp Act, the Townshend Acts, the Tea Act, and the colonial reaction to the Intolerable Acts.

In the first two parts of this volume, the author has uncovered little that is not already available in existing works, but he has made a real contribution in bringing this varied body of knowledge together in comparatively brief compass. For this service we may all, amateur and professional alike, be grateful. Without this preliminary work, as the author himself admits, the concluding section would be of considerably less value.

The final section is an attempt to discern the exact role played by the Philadelphia merchant in the coming of the Revolution. Mr. Jensen concludes that the "merchants, as a group, did not instigate the revolutionary movement in Philadelphia and that their participation in it was forced upon them by popular leaders to whom economic coercion of British merchants seemed a natural method of obtaining redress of grievances which were essentially political or constitutional in character." Jensen clearly recognizes that in such a large, diversified group as the merchant class every generalization would have its exceptions. Nevertheless, he finds the merchants a conservative group caught between the recognition that reforms in the British system were necessary and the fear of social unrest and economic
ruin which would result if they overstepped strictly constitutional appeals to the home government.

In the preparation of this volume the author has obviously consulted a wide variety of sources. He has, among other things, made excellent use of the valuable resources of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, especially of its rich collection of merchants' letters. The merchants' complaints of depression in the 1760's and 1770's, found in this correspondence, he holds unreliable. Perhaps the evidence Jensen needs to prove the prosperity he believes characterized this period is to be found in ledgers and account books, of which too little use has been made. Stronger evidence than that cited for the city's prosperity would have been helpful to his case.

One might wish that Mr. Jensen were not quite so free in the use of quotations, many of which add little to the "flavor" of the time and only serve to disturb the progress of the narrative. Whatever the shortcomings of this book, they are outweighed by its contributions. This is a volume well worth the consideration of anyone interested in either economic history, the American Revolution, or the history of Philadelphia.

Carlos R. Allen, Jr.


It is a pleasure to discover that The Quest for Power by Professor Jack P. Greene fulfills—indeed surpasses—the high expectations one had founded upon the excellent articles with which he prepared the way for this book. This volume studies the lower houses of the four southernmost colonies, between 1689 and 1776, in their rise to power within the colonies and as the key organs in the expression of colonial discontent with English ministerial policies. Professor Greene tries to discern a common pattern in the quest for power of the lower houses of Virginia, the two Carolinas, and Georgia, and explores the reasons for their quest, the assumptions underlying their claims, and the consequences for the coming of the Revolution of their rise to power.

By 1763 the lower houses had been successful in their struggle for power, the governors and councils by this time occupying a decidedly secondary place. They had achieved this by their control in four general areas: the raising and expenditure of public funds and the determination of other financial policies; their control of the civil list; their independence in establishing qualifications of voters and house members as well as in regulating house proceedings; and their infringement upon executive powers. Greene studies a variety of developments within these broad areas, including the assembly's role in issuing paper money, in setting fees of public officials, in controlling military and Indian affairs, and in appointing and instructing colonial agents. Where appropriate he gives a short summary of English practice and then examines American development; often the southern assemblies are found exercising powers which the House of Commons had
never achieved. In such instances, not being able to claim English precedents to defend their powers, the lower houses used the interesting argument that local precedents made a practice constitutional. Through much of this period they saw past practice within the colony (if it supported their pretensions) as a higher law than royal instructions to the colonial governor.

By 1763 the untiring insistence upon the rights of the assemblies had led to a “shift of the constitutional center of power” from the executive. In all four colonies this struggle had also developed extraordinarily skilled groups of politicians who, confronted by the British attempt to tighten and standardize imperial policy after that date, were well trained in the ways of opposition. Unfortunately, Greene brings these statesmen of the lower houses into his analysis less than seems necessary to a full comprehension of the struggle he traces. One chapter discusses the rise of these groups to social and economic influence, but thereafter he does little to relate the motives of these men to the development of the legislative bodies of which they were leaders. As a result, his story of the conflict often seems abstract—an account of the fight for power of a disembodied institution studied apart from its personnel. On the other hand, he occasionally (as on p. 424 in discussing North Carolina) implies that all of the colonists found certain grievances as irritating as did the pamphleteers and legislative leaders. One also wishes that he had availed himself of the opportunities afforded to examine the implications for later American constitutional practices of developments during the years he has studied. To cite but one example, the control of appropriations by the lower house achieved during this period was a precedent followed by the men who drafted the new constitutions after independence.

There are a few other, more important questions which arise in Professor Greene’s study. Throughout he suggests the year 1763 as a dividing line, with a stronger imperial policy evident after that year, not only in such generally applicable acts as the Currency and Townshend Acts, but also in the Ministry’s stand on issues that were peculiar to individual colonies. It is not, however, clear why he chooses this year or of what the substantial “tightening of the reins” on local issues consisted. Secondly, one wonders about his evaluation of the overall significance of England’s challenge to the power which the lower houses had achieved. He sees the American Revolution as “in essence,” not simply in part, “a war for political survival” of the rights of the assemblies.

Professor Greene’s book is orderly and straightforward, though the work might read better with less summarizing and recapitulating. His prose has the same characteristics of orderliness, directness, and precision. His very precision burdens his style, so that as one reads “the lower houses in the three older colonies” one is surprised not to find “the lower houses of assembly in the three older southern royal colonies.”

This book is based on a most thorough study of the sources here and in England, and Professor Greene uses both new and well known sources with great insight. His historical judgments are impeccable and one reads each chapter with the awareness that here is a book that can be relied upon.
This, of course, is saying a very great deal about a volume which covers as important a subject with as wide a scope as does this one. Thirty years ago, a reviewer would have called this a “model monograph,” and it is encouraging to find a book being written today which is as mature, craftsmanlike, and scholarly as the work of the best institutional historians in the earlier years of this century. Professor Greene’s book is going to be as classic a work as were some of those volumes.

Lehigh University

JOHN CARY


In this slim paperback book Professor James records almost everything known of the Virginian whose fame derives mostly from his activity in the Ohio Company whose records he preserved; and the volume is appropriately described, therefore, as “A companion to [the] George Mercer Papers,” previously edited by Lois Mulkearn, and to Professor James’s own book, The Ohio Company: Its Inner History.

A member, on his mother’s side, of a moderately distinguished family, George Mercer had a creditable civil and military career (as lieutenant colonel of the 2d Virginia Regiment, he served under General John Forbes in 1758) until 1763, when he went to England to seek governmental aid for the Ohio Company and an official appointment for himself. Unsuccessful in the former errand, he blundered in the latter and in 1765 accepted an appointment under the hated Stamp Act. Quickly disillusioned on his return to Virginia regarding this appointment, he made the second mistake of returning to England, where, Loyalist by necessity if not by conviction, he lived thereafter except when financial troubles forced him to take refuge for a time in France. He died in London in 1784.

As Professor James’s readers would expect, the present volume is well documented and based almost entirely on source materials, Freeman’s George Washington being one of the few secondary works relied upon. It is an unavoidable misfortune that the surviving documentation is so spotty and incomplete that a true biography is hardly possible and a smooth literary style difficult of attainment. Detail is uneven and proportion defective. In the absence of academic or scholastic records, a few entries from an account book must make do as evidence of young Mercer’s schooling. A list of the sales of Mercer’s property when he was financially distressed in 1774 is mere statistics that give little clue to the man. A final speculation on what-might-have-been supplies a conclusion to the study but contributes nothing to the knowledge of George Mercer’s own motives and reactions. Did he indeed feel much frustration, as the subtitle of the study seems to imply? Or is the phrase an allusion to the problems of the biographer?

The known facts, nevertheless, are here, and students would be glad to have as full and well documented an account of many another minor historic personage. The record may not tell all one would like to know about George
Mercer, but it tells most of what one needs to know. The book is indeed an essential supplement to the two previous volumes on the Ohio Company.

In the interest of complete accuracy, two details may be mentioned. Perhaps following Freeman, James says (as did the present reviewer in a recent publication) that three companies of soldiers joined Washington at the Great Meadows on June 9, 1754. Actually it must have been only two companies. Of the six-company Virginia Regiment, three companies were already with Washington; and one of the other three was that of Captain William Trent, originally raised as militia. This company objected to its subsequent inclusion in the regiment, and had refused to take Washington's orders; and it apparently was to replace it that Mercer, already with Washington as a lieutenant, received in June his commission to command a new company yet to be raised.

The statement a few pages later, that in 1758 Colonels Washington and Byrd were "subject to orders from Colonel John St. Clair," is one in which Sir John himself would have concurred; but in General Forbes's opinion St. Clair's appointment as deputy quartermaster-general constituted an overslaugh that exempted him from the exercise of command. That St. Clair, despite the commanding general's opinion, repeatedly asserted his rank and exercised command, was a source of recurring annoyance to the long-suffering Forbes.

It should be noted that the present work appeared originally in two installments in The Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine for January and April, 1963; and it has been reprinted unchanged, even to a few typographical errors, except that the notes, originally at the foot of the page, have been moved to the back of the book.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission


Volume three of The Madison Papers opens with Maryland's ratification of the Articles of Confederation in March, 1781, and closes in December of the same year. Like its predecessors it is a highly commendable piece of work. The editors are at their best in their role as detectives. The notes not only provide cross references, identifications, definitions of archaic words, and descriptions of the original documents, but also place each item in its proper historical context. Often the notes are longer than the document they describe. While the editors are justified in presenting more than correspondence, one questions the inclusion of such items as Madison's transcriptions from the secret journals of Congress which could have been omitted or calendared without detracting from the reader's ability to see what influenced Madison as well as what Madison influenced.

The volume consists predominantly of letters between the governor of Virginia and the state's delegation in Congress, and congressional motions, reports, and notes from the secret journals. Only fifty-seven of the 174 items are actually letters to or from Madison personally. The bulk of these are
from Edmund Pendleton, with a few from Thomas Jefferson, Joseph Jones, and David Jameson. Only twenty-one of Madison's own letters are extant: several to Pendleton, a few to Jefferson, and one each to his father and Philip Mazzei. In his July letter to Mazzei, Madison neatly summarized the military and financial events of the preceding year.

As in volumes one and two, there is rarely a hint in the colorless letters that Madison had a personal life. His letter to his father, in which he writes briefly of family matters, is the only exception, unless one wishes to include his emotional reaction to Yorktown. *The Papers* do present much about the progress of the war and the events in Congress. Nearly half of the book deals with military events: the continuous reports and rumors about the progress of the war in the South which involved Madison as a member of the committee corresponding with General Nathanael Greene, the invasion of Virginia, and the exciting build-up to Yorktown. Scattered throughout are references to the difficulty of supplying the military and civilian population of Virginia.

Most significantly the volume deals with the attempts of several men in Congress, especially Madison, to strengthen the national government. Immediately after Maryland completed the Confederation, Madison and others drafted a proposed amendment giving Congress the right to use the implied power (the editors believe this is Madison's first use of the term) of Article 13 to coerce the states, through economic sanctions, into obeying congressional decisions. At the same time, although Madison ignored Pendleton's proposal to appoint Washington a temporary dictator, he toyed with the idea of using a civilian-commanded military force to compel obedience to Congress. Also reflecting the philosophy of those favoring a stronger central government, Madison moved that General Anthony Wayne be given power to impress supplies which could then be credited to the states' congressional requisitions. As the notes point out, the nationalists knew what the acceptance of any such implied power would do to the strict construction argument. It was also Madison who moved for the creation of a strong court of appeals for admiralty cases, and congressional payment of the delegates from occupied states. Madison worked to strengthen the powers of Superintendent of Finance Robert Morris, proposing that he control funds borrowed abroad and that he administer the navy until a Secretary could be appointed. As could be expected he actively encouraged and defended the Impost of 1781.

This volume also offers important information on Virginia politics, Virginia's refusal to appear before a Pennsylvania court (the parallel to *Chisholm vs. Georgia* is noteworthy), the depreciation of and speculation in currency, and the various instructions to the several diplomats in Europe. The French alliance and the uncertain relation of Spain to the war are occasional topics, but the Mississippi question itself is less important than in 1780. Western lands played a minor role in the first months of 1781, but after Yorktown became as important as they had been in 1780.

Although Madison had demonstrated capacities for leadership during his first year in Congress, it was in 1781 that he assumed a major role. Regular in attendance, an active member of numerous committees, and often making
significant motions, James Madison in 1781 became a prominent nationalist espousing and fighting for the principles he would continue to fight for until his first term in the United States House of Representatives ten years later.

_The University of Wisconsin_  

KENNETH R. BOWLING


This excellent volume continues the study of the operation of the Jeffersonian party begun in Cunningham's earlier book which discussed the formation of party organization through the election of 1800. This is not a full political history, but rather an examination of the practical aspects of Jeffersonian Democracy. As such, it is successful.

Cunningham first deals with the patronage, Jefferson's most burdensome political problem. Both in theory and in practice he finds the President consistently partisan, appointing Republicans only, although trying to steer a middle course on removals between his own inclination for moderation and the demands of partisans for more extensive removals. At least, he tried to justify removals on some grounds other than politics.

Two chapters treat the party in Congress and the national party organization, which consisted of the Republican members of Congress. He might have called this era "the heyday of the caucus." Party affairs in Congress and national nominations were handled by the congressional caucus, and its decisions were considered at least semi-binding. Jefferson himself recognized the importance of party leadership in Congress, and he made repeated attempts to secure an administration spokesman there, but he had little success.

The party machinery in the states is detailed in three chapters. In New England Cunningham finds the most extensive growth of state party machinery in these eight years, for here Federalist resistance was most vigorous. Republican organization in New England was highly centralized through state caucus and committee systems, and in 1808 in Rhode Island came the innovation of the state nominating convention. In the Middle States the party machinery was most mature, with the caucus and caucus-convention in Pennsylvania, the state party convention in New Jersey and Delaware, and the state caucus in New York. In this region the organization was less centralized and permitted greater popular participation. In the South and the West where the Republican party was strongest, the party machinery was less fully developed. Except for Virginia, which had an elaborate organization, and Maryland, there were no formal state organizations nor state caucuses in this area. To summarize: there was relatively complete party organization by the Republicans in all except five of the seventeen states in 1808.

Party discipline and unity were difficult for the successful Republicans to maintain. Cunningham analyzes in detail three party schisms: the Burrittes,
the Pennsylvania split, and the Quid movement. He finds the Jefferson administration siding with the opponents of Burr but maintaining neutrality in the Pennsylvania imbroglio. The Quids, he maintains (and this analysis he developed more fully in a recent issue of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*), were neither a national third party nor a movement led by John Randolph; rather, "Quid" was a term used to describe various third party men with little in common except their opposition to the majority faction of the party within their own state. His argument is convincing. All Republican factions claimed to be genuine and pledged their allegiance to Jefferson, and as long as Jefferson remained in office factionalism was held in check.

An admirable chapter on the management of the press revises the earlier views of Frank L. Mott. Cunningham does not find Jefferson disassociated from the press, but rather in frequent contact with Republican editors and newspapers, encouraging them with subscriptions and supporting them with printing patronage. At the capital the *National Intelligencer* became the administration organ and national party newspaper, and Duane's *Aurora* in Philadelphia also became a most influential spokesman for the national administration.

Finally, Cunningham examines electioneering techniques, which he finds most open and direct in the South and West. Such devices as rallies and celebrations, stump speaking, and voluminous issues of pamphlet, broadside, and newspaper propaganda did not change very much over the years. The Republicans in these various ways offered a program of political action with which the voter could and did identify.

Jefferson is the central figure throughout. It was he who mobilized the Republican party for its victory in 1800 and who guided the party through its first test of holding power. He succeeded to the point of achieving a party succession to Madison in 1809. The President is presented here as an effective national politician, skillfully keeping factionalism in bounds and fully understanding the value and use of party. Certainly his party system proved workable and enduring, perhaps the most vital of American political institutions and the most valuable of Jefferson's legacies.

Two criticisms might be made of this pioneering work. First, Cunningham does not examine party operation and management in the state legislatures—in the election of United States senators, for example. Surely this would have added to his discussion of state party machinery. Second, the reader is never certain throughout the book of what is the exception and what is the rule, especially with regard to local organizational matters. Perhaps this is the result of the very fragmentary nature of much of the evidence. The analysis is the surest in those states where good monographs exist on state politics during this period.

These minor defects do not mar an excellent and attractive book which contains a workable bibliography and index and places the notes at the foot of each page. This reviewer can only admire Cunningham's exhaustive research into both printed sources and manuscript sources, newspapers, pamphlets, and broadsides from collections throughout the country. Future

For nearly two centuries God-fearing sequestered communities known as the Amish pursued the even tenor of their eighteenth-century chart, wanting nothing more from the outside world than to be allowed to follow in the steps of their fathers. But the twentieth century could not leave them unnoticed. For the past three decades they and their customs and ways of life have afforded attractive (not to say sensational) copy for reporters, journalists, novelists, playwrights, and radio and television. They have become the number one tourist attraction of beautiful rural Pennsylvania.

Despite all this excessive publicity there still remained much error and confusion about the actual mode of life, the social outlook and religious belief of the Amish communities. Fortunately there have been serious efforts in recent years on the part of historians and sociologists to furnish the intelligent reading public with more exact information about the Amish. We mention here Calvin Bachman’s The Old Order Amish of Lancaster County (1942); Walter M. Kollmorgen’s Culture of a Contemporary Community: The Old Order Amish of Lancaster County (1942); and Elmer L. Smith’s The Amish Today (1961), all excellent works. Of necessity they have much in common. They deal primarily with the Old Order Amish of Lancaster County and were written by observers who themselves were not members of the Amish community.

In John A. Hostetler’s Amish Society we have the work of a scholar who has sought further horizons for his material: the Amish and their numerous splits and splinters wherever they be, beyond Lancaster County, throughout western Pennsylvania, in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, in the far west, in Canada, all have received study by the author. But the peculiar value of Dr. Hostetler’s work lies beyond the historical and sociological material which has been so well presented elsewhere. Rather it is unique in the deep and sensitive understanding of the consequences of modern industry and urbanization upon a tight religious community struggling against the intrusions of our technological age, upon a religious society bent upon refusing to accept what the outside world calls progress. The author traces this inherently dramatic struggle; the stress and pressure from without; the slow, insidious moral and social erosion taking place within that society. For this task Dr. Hostetler was equipped as no other. He was born into an Amish family and reared as an Amishman. He met the challenge of the outer world to seek a higher education than the Amish charter permitted. He is today a well trained, highly respected researcher in the social sciences, a member of the faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Pennsylvania State University.

Although Dr. Hostetler has explored and exposed the internal strength
and weakness of Amish community life as no other writer has done, the reader must expect no ultimate answers to questions such as these: What is the cost to the human spirit of progress as exemplified in our modern technological and industrial civilization? How rapidly can we assimilate and adjust to the many changes of this age? Change, change everywhere! How rapidly dare we change? And having changed, is the change worth while? These and similar questions echo from cities, from villages, and across the countryside.

The author offers no ultimate answers to such pertinent questions, but he does throw much light upon them in the last chapters of his book, whose captions alone will indicate the direction of their content: Breaking With the Past; Group Cleavage and Social Change; Tension Stress in the Community; Social Change and Illness; Responses to Change; The Future of Amish Society.

In the problems presented and in the questions posed there is an element of dramatic conflict: the conflict within a society that had resisted worldliness for two centuries only in the end to succumb to the forces of progress. It would be a bitter irony indeed if our pushbutton civilization had irrevocably destroyed a precious way of life only to find itself standing on the brink of massive suicide listening to the Faustian chorus of spirits as they plaintively sing: "Woe! woe! thou hast it destroyed, the beautiful world, with powerful fist; in ruin 'tis hurled, by the blow of a demigod shattered! The scattered fragments into the void we carry, deploring the beauty perished beyond restoring. Mightier for the children of men, brightlier built it again, in thine own bosom build it anew!"

The reader lays Dr. Hostetler's book aside with the feeling that nothing further need be said about the Amish. And yet, on the other hand, fifty years hence some sociologist may give us the last word—the Amish and their like have met the challenge of the new era, not by running away from progress, from science and technology, but through them creating a new soil from which may spring perennially a new life of the spirit.

Muhlenberg College

Preston A. Barba


Even the most rabid Civil War enthusiasts who pride themselves on their familiarity with such exotic jargon as "Helena quick-step," "hoosey-dooksy," or "barrel-shirt," may not recognize the term "Galvanized Yankees" at once.

This was the name given to six Union volunteer regiments formed by Confederate prisoners who were willing to enlist in the United States Army on condition that they would not have to fight against the South. Organized in the last months of the war, they were assigned to protect the western territory against savage outbreaks of Indian warfare, and remained in service more than a year after the war had ended, fighting in pathetically small groups against some of the most vicious warriors of the plains.
The obvious question as to what kind of loyalty could be expected from enemy troops out of prison camps is fully treated in early chapters, and when it is understood that the Confederate army, as well as the Union forces, contained many foreign-born volunteers or conscripts who had no patriotic roots in American soil, and many unwilling draftees who had no interest in the war that would compensate for their wretched months in prison pens, the project seems more logical.

The idea really developed because of Pennsylvania politics in 1864, when two officers convinced Lincoln that the use of Confederate prisoners as military substitutes would relieve demands for unpopular draft calls in a vital election year. Stanton and Grant were dubious, but "recruiting" began at Rock Island, Illinois, and after considerable delay, the former Confederates were in blue uniforms headed for the West. Although desertions were anticipated on a large scale, the percentage was little different from that of regular army units.

This is not Civil War history in the usual sense, because the war was over by the time these regiments were in their assigned posts at drab little stations along the Overland Stage Route, the Butterfield Route, and at unknown spots like Dead Man's Ranch and Rabbit Ear Mound. The author describes the travels and travails of each company of each regiment, as they rode escort for the early stage lines, guarded the new telegraph lines, rescued wagon trains and endured the furnace heat of stifling summer and the winter blizzard, always with Indian raids threatening from the nearest ridge. The Cheyenne were on the warpath to avenge the outrageous Chivington massacre, and there were always unexpected attacks to drive off valuable stage or wagon horses. In between was the indescribable boredom of military routine in a desolate desert.

The author has utilized a vast amount of material from regimental records and histories, personal accounts, and sources of Western history to provide an extremely detailed and marvelously readable account of early Plains history. The enormous area occupied by these tiny military units is indicated in excellent end-paper maps, and the organization of the book, describing the experiences of company after company in each remote post, gives the reader the feeling of having performed a continuous tour of duty.

This is one of the best of the author's books on mid-Western history and provides an exciting and original description of events far removed from Civil War battlefields, just at the time when the nation was first becoming aware of the great adventure of the American West.

_Franklin and Marshall College_  
_FredERIC S. KLEIN_

_DeR Folks At Home: The Civil War Letters of Leo W. and John I. Faller._


Shortly after the Civil War began, Leo and John Faller of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, enlisted in the Pennsylvania Reserves. _Dear Folks At Home_ is largely a compilation of the letters which these brothers wrote concerning
their army experiences. Both of the Fallers possessed a gift of gab. The spelling (as left untouched by the editor) was about average, as was also the grammar. The style was rambling as servicemen’s letters oftentimes are.

The early letters were filled with typical expressions of patriotism and idealism of the unseasoned volunteer. Especially evident also was the Civil War soldier’s attachment to his officers. Proud of the opportunity to serve their state and nation, the brothers gloried in the little achievements of camp life and garrison duty around Washington. When this got monotonous, they chafed at the bit, anxious to get into battle. Constantly short of stationery and money, wanting special articles of clothing, and longing for delicacies to supplement their army rations, the Fallers besieged the folks at home with a stream of requests. So long as the youths were in the vicinity of Washington, the folks in Carlisle did their best to honor these requisitions.

The glory of war took on a new aspect in the summer of 1862 with the first real taste of battle. General McClellan’s hesitant Peninsula Campaign and his repulse just short of Richmond, which denied victory, disgruntled the men of the Pennsylvania Reserves. After Leo, the younger of the brothers, was killed at Antietam, in September, 1862, the remaining brother carried on the correspondence. John’s letters assumed a more realistic and bitter tone as the war exacted its toll among his comrades. The war almost took on the aspects of a holy cause and much of his original patriotism disappeared. Taken prisoner during the battle of the Wilderness, John spent five months at Andersonville and another five months at Florence, South Carolina, before being paroled and sent home in a very poor state of health. From his experiences and those of others, he later wrote an address on Andersonville which brings Dear Folks At Home to a close.

Milton E. Flower has done a good job of editing the letters, and his connecting narrative helps tie them together nicely. Neither the letters nor the account of Andersonville contains any new material of significance, and the very nature of the material confines its appeal to a rather limited local audience.

Temple University

Samuel R. Bright


“This damned morality,” exclaimed Lord Melbourne, “will ruin everything.” While morality, or principle, if you please, may not ruin quite everything, J. Rogers Hollingsworth of the University of Illinois amply demonstrates it can smash the delicately balanced machinery of a political party. He proves his point in a study of repeated Democratic failures beginning in 1893 and culminating with the debacle of 1904 when the conservative Alton B. Parker was “defeated by acclamation.”

Uncompromising devotion to principle debilitated party leadership, and it is as party leaders, not as men of courage, of social conscience, or of gold
or silver, that Hollingsworth assesses Grover Cleveland and William Jennings Bryan. By this standard Cleveland and Bryan failed miserably. Of course, they faced great problems, such as the severe depression following the panic of 1893. Furthermore, effectively leading Democrats, members of a truly national party, is more difficult than leading the more regionally based Republicans. The seriously weakened Democracy, however, could not afford the luxury of factionalism. But in 1904 the Clevelandites and Bryanites ignored the new issues, particularly those engendered by the rise of big business, and still bickered over the issues of the 1890's.

Hollingsworth's excellent history of the Democratic party for a dozen years impressively documents his thesis. Time and time again Cleveland and Bryan adhered to principle while dividing the party. Cleveland "inflexible and unyielding" demanded unconditional repeal of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act even though bankers J. P. Morgan and Jacob Schiff, steel manufacturer Andrew Carnegie, and politicians David B. Hill and Arthur P. Gorman favored some kind of compromise that would placate the silverites. Most tragically Cleveland seemed unaware that his uncompromising attitude had split his party. Further actions by Cleveland in maintaining the gold reserve, in attacking fellow Democrats instead of corporation lobbyists for the Wilson-Gorman tariff, and in supporting management during the Pullman Strike virtually disintegrated the party. The Democratic rout in the election of 1894 reflected Cleveland's handiwork and began a decline that lasted a decade. "When the elections of that year are considered in proper perspective, it is obvious that William Jennings Bryan and the free silver heresy of 1896 were not as important in contributing to the fall of Democratic fortunes as has generally been assumed."

Unfortunately the mantle of party leadership devolved upon Bryan, who was "hardly more capable as a coalition leader." A moralizing, self-righteous agrarian, he was unable to construct an appealing program for the diverse elements of the Democratic party and proved as uncompromising as Cleveland. Bryan insisted as late as 1904 that the Democracy reaffirm its stand for free silver. At the same time Judge Parker was as ridiculous when he pledged himself to uphold the gold standard. In the midst of the progressive era "silver and gold remained the most explosive issue in the party's ranks."

The terrible defeat of 1904 was a turning point. Democrats finally realized that in order to succeed they must compromise their differences. Calling themselves Progressives, they fused the Clevelandite concern for good government (dropping laissez faire) with the Bryanite concern for the welfare of the masses (dropping free silver). The Democratic party was at last on the road to recovery.

"The Democrats had been their own worst enemies." The conventional heroes Cleveland and Bryan had most devastatingly attacked each other, and their obstinacy had handed the federal government to the Republicans. On the other hand, the politicos who were not hampered by ideological principles—Arthur P. Gorman and David B. Hill, and even Tammany Hall's Richard Croker and Charles Murphy—had tried to bridge the differences within the party—when their local interests were not at stake. They emerge from this study with enhanced reputations.
This book is admirably researched. Hollingsworth has read extensively in manuscript and printed primary sources as well as in secondary. He writes well and is imaginative in his methodology. For example, by using a school census, voting records, and the federal census, Hollingsworth assesses the strength of both political parties among the various ethnic groups in Chicago. The Whirligig of Politics is an important addition to our literature on American political parties.

Pennsylvania State University

Ark Hoogenboom


Here is a book to tell the story of "the creation of an industrial society" in America by way of a collection of documents that spans the years between the Philadelphia Exposition of 1876 and the St. Louis Exposition of 1904. It is a book addressed to the scholarly layman, that person who likes serious history without caring to be a historian. To guide this reader, Professor Diamond provides a general essay on the era and introduces each section of the book with brief comments.

The chief strength of the book is that it presents an ample record of what a generation of historians writing about this period has accomplished. Professor Diamond documents the familiar but important subjects: technology, the factory, the businessman, the trusts, the immigrant, the city, the farmer, the Negro, education, and Social Darwinism. Even those who have been over this course many times will find documents that remain helpful, interesting, and a few that are moving. In one selection a Mrs. John Sherwood joins those who have "dilated of late years upon the 'decay of conversation'" with unintentionally hilarious advice to a young society girl on what to talk about at a dinner party. In another selection, Negroes of Massachusetts protest to President McKinley in stilted but forceful prose, against the upsurge in burnings, butcherings, and lynchings with which the South closed the last years of the century.

Omissions and misjudgments, in a work like this, are almost inescapable. Some readers will regret the omission of the Far West and the white man's South. Perhaps the influence of Darwin's work on religious thought and feeling—in this era when growing numbers of people found that they needed a will to believe—might have been included. Booker T. Washington is probably more revealing of the difficulties of the post-Reconstruction Negro than Frederick Douglass, whom Professor Diamond selects. And Mark Twain's opposition to imperialism was less steadfast than the inclusion of one of his anti-imperialist articles might lead us to believe. This fickleness makes Twain more interesting, but less representative of American anti-expansionist sentiment. Moreover, the selection on "Taylorism"—industrial efficiency—gives the American factory of the period a deceptively modern aspect. Frederick W. Taylor at this time was hardly known in the industrial world and most of those who knew him considered him a crank.
Nevertheless, in a work of this scope, these objections come to resemble quibbles. Professor Diamond has undoubtedly given us a good rendering of what has been the long-standing interpretation of this era. In fact, this very achievement is the book’s limitation.

The selection and arrangement of these documents, and the comments on them are governed by a historical outlook whose drawbacks are just becoming apparent. Until quite recently, historians writing about post-Reconstruction America gave primary emphasis to the machine, the factory, and the trust. These were the “transforming influences” (as Professor Diamond calls them here), the technological imperatives to which most everything else responded. From this standpoint, America in the last quarter of the nineteenth century easily became an over-determined place, where the evidence of choice and contingency could readily be overlooked.

The recent interest in industrial growth, which has given the historian a new awareness of the diverse economic experience of nations—industrialized, industrializing, and attempting to industrialize—has served to discredit much of the technological bias. One of the important conclusions that can be drawn from the understanding of industrial growth is that there is no one best way to create or run an industrial society. In fact, the word industrialism, itself, has come to denote less specific information than we once imagined; for the relationship between men may be almost as varied in different industrial societies as history has shown them to be in different agricultural societies. Much that was abstracted from English and American industrial experience and considered normal, now often appears to be quite unique. Moreover, it is apparent that technology plays an essential but limited role in the creation of an industrial society. As one economic historian has recently put it, “it takes more than industry to industrialize.” Precisely what this “more” was in America is one of the questions that confronts American historians today. Professor Diamond ignores all this. The panorama of America presented through his documents and comments clearly indicates where American historians have been, but give almost no inkling of where they are now, or where they may be going.
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