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A good deal of courage, or even temerity, was needed to undertake yet another biography of Benjamin Franklin. The story has been told concisely by Carl Becker, exhaustively by Carl Van Doren, and incomparably by the subject himself. Mr. Aldridge has not been intimidated by the competition, nor need he have been. For his book is excellent: elegant in proportions, accurate in scholarship, lively in style.

If this biography lacks the wit and verve of the Autobiography, Mr. Aldridge has succeeded where Franklin himself admittedly fell short—in organization. Skillfully interweaving the threads of his story, foreshadowing and then recapitulating, the author has managed to reduce an incredibly eventful and versatile life to a coherent and continually interesting narrative. He has, moreover, resisted the temptation to write a Life and Times; background and setting are adequately rendered but the hero remains resolutely at stage center.

Although Mr. Aldridge states that “the view of Franklin's personality expressed in this book is entirely my own,” many readers will find that it is, in large measure, their view as well. Franklin's life is by this time so thoroughly documented that the main lines of the portrait are too clearly etched to be radically altered. Nor does Mr. Aldridge alter them. He tells, and tells admirably, the stories which have made his hero a folk figure: Franklin walking up Market Street with his rolls, Franklin flying his kite, Franklin wearing his fur hat at Passy, Franklin moralizing on an image of the rising sun in the painting at Independence Hall. The reader comes upon these anecdotes with the pleasure not of novelty but of familiarity.

“Realizing,” Mr. Aldridge says, “that certain aspects of Franklin as a human being had never been revealed in print, I decided that I would attempt to portray Franklin the man.” But somehow the man Franklin eludes him. There is something outsized and protean and enigmatic about Franklin which resists the biographer's categories and definitions. Superior to malice, indifferent to envy, tolerant of human weakness (except his own), Franklin immensely enjoyed himself, living his life with a gusto and intensity more characteristic of the subjects of Elizabeth I than of George III. Franklin was a genius but without the streak of melancholia or abnormality so often found in great men. His character in retrospect looms up as larger than life size: his energy, his generosity, his versatility, his extraordinary insight into human nature and, in particular, into his own nature.

A superb self-dramatist, Franklin saw life as a stage in which he cast
himself in a dominant role. Not surprisingly, during a long lifetime he fell into self-contradiction. His biographer points out these discrepancies, and despairs: "One hardly knows what to believe." Indeed, one does not. It is, after all, this self-confessed actor in Franklin's nature that keeps us at arm's length, that makes us feel that the benevolence, the serenity, the homespun wisdom were a mask with which he confronted the world and behind which he refused to allow us to penetrate. The reader puts down this biography with a renewed sense of the fascination of Franklin's character and of the enigma at the center of that character.

University of Delaware

Charles H. Bohmer


Mr. Connor has written a book which is mercifully unconventional. Introducing himself as a "political theorist" and describing his book as a "survey of Franklin's political ideas," he leads us to expect one of those tedious treks through the whole gauntlet of "classical" problems in political theory—the nature of man, natural law, the social compact, constitutionalism, etc.—from which the hero usually emerges shorn of all of his charm and liveliness. But Connor surprises us, for he has little to say about Franklin's thoughts about the "big problems" in political science (for the good reason that the Doctor himself never explored them systematically), and concentrates instead on devising a formula to explain all of Franklin's political thought and action.

This task, comparable in difficulty to discovering a law of physics, the author believes he has accomplished by postulating a political ideal to which Franklin allegedly devoted his whole life as a public man. The ideal was the "New American Order" (the term is Connor's). Its components were: (1) virtue, which Connor subdivides into benevolence, "happy mediocrity," republican simplicity, and a concept which he calls "the land of labor"; (2) dynamic evolution, by which Connor means Franklin's wish that "society would increase numerically, expand geographically, and rise culturally"; and (3) harmoniousness—Franklin's hope that "political harmony would permeate the virtuous society."

This formula seems terribly ingenious until one asks what was new about the objectives which composed it and in what way they were distinctively Franklin's. Every thinking man in eighteenth-century America would have fancied himself a patron and promoter of virtue, growth, harmony, honesty, sincerity, and motherhood as well. The problem in using such universally held values as pegs on which to hang a man's career is that one runs the risk of explaining everything, and nothing. In the opinion of this reviewer, the author has not successfully negotiated this risk.

Having described the "New American Order," Connor seeks its intellectual sources in Franklin's readings and its psychic sources in the Doctor's soul. As for Franklin's readings, Connor acknowledges, as all Franklin
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scholars must, the importance of Cotton Mather's *Essays to Do Good*, Daniel Defoe's *An Essay upon Projects*, and various books on Newtonian science. He attempts to break new ground by showing the similarity between certain aspects of Franklin's "New Order" and the ideas of the Graeco-Roman moralists—Lucretius, Epictetus, Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch. He establishes a similarity, but one feels that it is as contrived as the "New American Order" itself. Strangely enough, Connor ignores Franklin's demonstrable debt to John Locke, Thomas Gordon, and John Trenchard, and that whole group of political writers whom Caroline Robbins calls the "Eighteenth Century Commonwealthmen."

In searching for the psychic sources of the "New American Order," Connor, noting that "Franklin has yet to find an analyst," presumes to supply the deficiency by not merely putting the Doctor on the couch, but by subjecting him to "an inverse sort of psychoanalysis." Connor's diagnosis is that Franklin was racked by "social guilt," by embarrassment at his tradesman's background, and at the avarice and philistinism which the upper classes commonly imputed to men of his occupation; thus, to absolve himself from the patricians' charges, he became his country's foremost advocate of philanthropy and humanitarianism. This theory does not, in the first place, square with the known facts, for Franklin was very proud of his tradesman's beginnings, as his lifelong penchant for advertising himself as a printer (remember his epitaph and his will) attests.

In the second place, though Connor is not aware of it, Franklin has had an analyst and a very competent one, A. Bronson Feldman. Writing in Theodor Reik's journal *Psychoanalysis*, V (Summer, 1957), 33-54, Feldman, in an article entitled "Ben Franklin—Thunder Master," concludes that the condition shaping Franklin's character was anal-eroticism tinctured with an exceedingly strong "flatus complex." How far this diagnosis can be used to explain Franklin's political thought is a question on which the present reviewer would not care to speculate, but it is certainly no more irrelevant than Connor's own diagnosis. Playing psychiatrist is extremely hazardous; this we humanists should never forget.

In conclusion we can say this about *Poor Richard's Politicks*; it is stimulating, unconventional, but on the whole unconvincing.

*Yale University*

JAMES H. HUTSON

*Law and Authority in Colonial America*. Edited by George Athan Billias. (Barre, Mass.: Barre Publishers, 1965. Pp. 208. $5.00.)

Like many volumes of collected essays, this one bears a title promising much more than is delivered. The book is not, in fact, a comprehensive survey of law and authority in colonial America. It is, however, a collection of well written and instructive essays by distinguished legal and colonial scholars which deal with various aspects of law and authority in selected American colonies during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The essays concern only four of the thirteen colonies. Massachusetts provides material for seven, and New York, Maryland and Virginia are dealt with
in single essays by Herbert Alan Johnson, Joseph H. Smith, and Wilcomb E. Washburn respectively.

This volume is an outgrowth of the Fifteenth Conference on Early American History and holds much that is of value to both legal and colonial historians. Some of the essays, such as George L. Haskins's study of the role of English common law in the formulation of Massachusetts dower law, and L. Kinvin Wroth's analysis of the jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Vice-Admiralty Court, are detailed studies which will be of most interest to the specialist. Others are broad, interpretive pieces.

But whether detailed or general, all of these articles provide insights which should aid in the continuing re-evaluation of the American Revolution. Several essays, such as those of John D. Cushing and Hiller B. Zobel on the Massachusetts judiciary, deal directly with the Revolutionary period. Others, especially the studies of Mark DeWolfe Howe and Wilcomb E. Washburn, provide many examples of how the breakdown of the traditional concepts of law and authority made the American Revolution a possibility.

Undoubtedly the most controversial articles are two very different approaches to Massachusetts Puritanism by Clifford K. Shipton and Darrett B. Rutman. Shipton's disputatious essay is a polemic against the generalizations historians have made about "Puritan Orthodoxy." He makes a strong case for the idea that the citizens of the Bay Colony recognized and implemented the principle of separation of church and state. He further maintains that the authority wielded by the state permitted a degree of democracy unusual in the seventeenth century. He argues that the Bay government greatly respected freedom of the individual conscience and that the actions taken against Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson, and the Quakers were civil procedures to protect the foundations of the state rather than persecutions for deviations in faith.

Yet despite Shipton's well earned reputation as an outstanding colonial scholar, some readers may find that his defense of Puritan authority smells of special pleading. Even less convincing are such generalizations as his claims that "Massachusetts in her first century and a half was an ideal proving ground for the principles on which our democratic way of life rests," and that "The critical moment of the American Revolution came in the first decade of settlement, when the individual settlers took into their own hands and managed, through democratic town and church machinery, all of the matters of property, civil government, and religion which could be handled on that level."

Just as Shipton attacks the stereotype of "Puritan Orthodoxy," Rutman assails "the historians' Puritanism." This term, he believes, "has little to do with reality in New England." Rutman's attack is aimed particularly at Perry Miller and the other intellectual historians who have dominated the interpretation of New England history in recent years. With effective examples he shows that Massachusetts society was rent with divisions and suffused with anti-authoritarian attitudes. The tenor of his argument is that "Puritanism" as it has been presented by the intellectual historians was in fact little more than the lifeless diagram of an ideal society drawn up by
the elite of the Bay Colony. Historians wishing to understand the real nature of Massachusetts society must, he believes, forsake the study of intellectual sources and dirty their hands with the records and archives if they would understand how life in New England was actually lived. This is an essay with which intellectual historians will have to reckon.

Notwithstanding the variety of subjects and approaches contained in these essays, some consistent patterns relating to the nature of law in colonial America do emerge. Most of these essays illustrate the point, some of them explicitly, that the law as practiced in the colonies was a much more effective and sophisticated instrument than many historians—notably Daniel Boorstin—have supposed. The degree of legal expertise demonstrated by American judges, lawyers and legislators does not square with the popular stereotype of a crude and uneducated American legal society. In addition, the myth that American legal institutions were borrowed on a wholesale basis from the English common law is successfully exploded by several of the articles.

The appearance of this book suggests that familiar complaints about the neglect of American legal history are fast becoming passé. Certainly our understanding of colonial law is far from complete, but these essays provide ample evidence that there now are many perceptive and talented scholars laboring in the field.

California State College at Hayward

Alan M. Smith


The American Forts Series, edited by Stewart H. Holbrook, is introduced by a volume of particular interest to Pennsylvanians. More important, Mr. O'Meara's Guns at the Forks is lively, intelligent, and informative in content, well illustrated, and attractively printed.

"The Forks" of the title are the forks of the Ohio River, at the present Pittsburgh, and the guns are those of the five forts that have stood there, identified by Mr. O'Meara as Fort Prince George, Fort Duquesne, Mercer's Fort, Fort Pitt, and Fort Fayette. Other writers have dealt with all these posts, but this is the first volume devoted explicitly to their successive histories. The scope of the study is sufficiently broad to include colorful and explanatory background material that places the succession of forts in historical perspective.

The present work is not a formal report of original research. It relies upon the works of previous students, in which the author has read widely and well. The entries in his bibliography are somewhat unconventionally abbreviated, but the reader should have no difficulty finding the listed books and articles in a good library. No distinction is drawn between sources and secondary works; one or two items are listed twice.

The great values of the present book are the author's comprehension of his subject, his able selection of pertinent facts and quotations, and the effective manner in which the material is conveyed to the reader. A book so
informative and so readable is almost as rare as it is desirable. Add to this the fact that the book is well illustrated, with sixteen pages of plates, two endpaper maps, and eight maps and diagrams in the text; add that it is attractively printed and bound.

A few factual errors are probably inevitable and are annoying chiefly because the book is generally so good. A few names are wrong; Heckewelder and La Chauvignerie are misspelled, for example, and Edmunds Swamp appears as Edwards Swamp. The 42d Regiment appears as the 44th; and the 77th is so designated prematurely; in 1758 it was the 62d, or the First Highland Battalion. Forbes left a garrison of 100 Pennsylvanians and 100 Virginians (not 200 Virginians) at Pittsburgh in 1758. The author repeats the error of applying the name “Fort Prince George” to Captain Trent’s makeshift defense of 1754, though he states correctly that Colonel Mercer’s fort of 1758 was never called Fort Pitt. In fact, “Fort Prince George” was the name selected in advance for a formally planned fort that Virginia had no opportunity to build. One error has been compounded by the indexer: Mr. O’Meara mentions three officers named Mercer (John, George, and Hugh); unfortunately he supplies the given name of only the least significant, and in the index all three are thrown together in the entry for Captain John Mercer. Such details may be corrected, however, in a subsequent printing.

It does not appear that subsequent volumes planned for the American Forts Series will deal so directly with Pennsylvania; but this first volume is a welcome one and promises well for the series as a whole.


Frederick Jackson Turner’s epic pronouncement that the frontier was fundamental in the formation of American character has produced a torrent of books and articles largely general in nature and post-Revolutionary in scope. Robert W. Ramsey, with imaginative use of sources and painstaking care, has written a vital book about the particular people who settled a specific area in the period around 1754, and has arrived at some important conclusions.

Carolina Cradle is a study of the migration of settlers and their families during the period 1747-1762 from the mid-Atlantic region of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey to that portion of Rowan County, North Carolina, which lies between the Catawba and Yadkin rivers. To trace the movement of these settlers Ramsey made imaginative use of state and local, public and private archives from New Jersey to North Carolina. Twenty pages of bibliography include journals, letters, deeds, tavern licenses, tax lists, wills, court dockets, land warrants, account books, newspapers, and birth and communion records, all of which attest to the originality of his research. The bibliography is a rich resource for colonial historians and genealogists.
After considering geography, economic conditions in Europe and the colonies, social and religious motivation, abundance of cheap land, and international conflict as determinants for the migration to the Carolina backcountry, the author deals primarily with the identity of the original settlers, their origin outside the colonies, their movements within the colonies, and the exact location of their settlement in Rowan County. Since most of the Carolina settlers came from or through the mid-Atlantic region, this core section of the book will be of particular interest to readers of Pennsylvania History.

The book discusses the Germans, Irish, and Scotch-Irish as national groups, and the Quakers and Baptists as migrant denominations. Other chapters detail the establishment of the town of Salisbury, the economic order, the life of the people, and the effect of the French and Indian War on the settlement.

Ramsey concludes that the chief reason for the movement to the Northwest Carolina frontier was economic—soil depletion on Maryland's Eastern Shore and rising land prices in Pennsylvania. An important cause for the migration of individuals was the death of the head of a family whose divided estate made it possible for the sons to migrate.

The author finds that the English-speaking settlers went to the Yadkin-Catawba basin before the Germans, and that the Scotch-Irish outnumbered the Germans considerably. He also discovers that the earlier settlers came from the overpopulated Eastern Shore of Maryland rather than Pennsylvania, and that the later migrants had first settled in Lancaster County.

Ramsey further concludes that there was very little squatting after 1752, that the desirable land was legally covered by land grants, and that the pioneers established no churches during the period. The necessity for establishing and maintaining central authority was clearly recognized, and people traveled great distances with surprising safety and ease in a region so recently taken from the Indians.

The sum and considerable substance of this book as stated by the author is "that any assessment of southern history should emphasize exploitation of the land and the eighteenth-century evolution of family relationships, clan loyalties, and a cultural homogeneity which in countless cases spanned at least three generations, two continents, and a half-dozen American colonies!"

Ramsey has set a standard for the research that must be done to document Turner's thesis in the pre-Revolutionary period and in more than a general way. Without it one must still ask: What was the American frontier?

The Hagley Museum

George H. Gibbon


There was a sense of special urgency in the air as Governor Duquesne sent his canoe brigades up the St. Lawrence River early in the spring of 1754. In official dispatches from Versailles and from Indian runners in the
American woods he had learned that the English, principally the Virginia colonists, were reasserting their claim to the Ohio country. Duquesne's four brigades carried men, materiel, and supplies to build a fort at the Forks of the Ohio, the most strategic point and key to the control of the rich fur lands to the south of the Great Lakes.

The French politely refused to accept twenty-one-year-old George Washington's charges that they were trespassing on English land, drove away a construction crew of Virginians at the Forks, erected their own Fort Duquesne on the spot, and forced the surrender of Washington at hastily-constructed Fort Necessity. A year later, the angered British lion was badly wounded when the attempt of Edward Braddock and his redcoats to oust the French and drive them into Lake Erie met with disastrous defeat. The French were thus left firmly in control of forts from Lake Champlain westward.

Massachusetts Governor William Shirley sought to dislodge the French from Fort Niagara, only to have a French fleet with reinforcements for the fort slip through his blockade. A consolation prize fell to the British when Robert Monckton captured Fort Beausejour, the beginning of their control of the Bay of Fundy region.

The Seven Years' War, the European phase of the war, opened in 1756. New commanders were assigned to the North American theater. To direct the French came the Marquis de Montcalm, whose initial major effort netted him Oswego. About a year later, while Lord Loudon, his English counterpart, was engaged in an abortive attempt to capture Louisbourg, Montcalm took Fort William Henry on Lake George. Into the early winter Indian and French raiding parties penetrated into central New York. France was now at the height of her power in the New World. And she was meeting notable success in Europe as well.

The next spring, shortly after he entered the cabinet, William Pitt, the Great Commoner, gained direct supervision of the war. Instead of containing the French in North America, he was determined to go on the offensive and to drive them out altogether. The tides of war reversed and the French position steadily deteriorated.

Although the new British commander, James Abercromby, failed to dislodge Montcalm from Fort Carillon (Ticonderoga), Jeffrey Amherst and James Wolfe took Louisbourg. Frontenac at the head of the St. Lawrence on Lake Ontario fell; and Fort Duquesne at the Forks of the Ohio was blown up by its defenders before John Forbes could take it from them. These important French losses were all suffered in 1758.

The next year was even more momentous. Niagara fell to the British. The hard-pressed French destroyed Fort Carillon and nearby Fort St. Frederic and retreated to the St. Lawrence Valley. The near-mortal blow came on the Plains of Abraham when Montcalm was out-maneuvered by Wolfe and Quebec fell to the British. About a year later, the anticlimax came with the taking of Montreal.

These are the highlights of the Battle for a Continent. The author is not content with these alone, because he is concerned with all of the military
phases of what is generally called the French and Indian War, or the Great War for the Empire. As attested by this and his previous related studies, Harrison Bird is a superb military historian. He knows what he is talking about. He is so well versed in the records of the campaigns and so familiar with the terrain and waters on which they were conducted that his books bear the immediacy of the account of a reporter who is permitted to accompany and observe whatever he will of the movements and engagements of the armies and naval forces. Added to this is the author’s ability to tell his story in non-technical terms and in a highly attractive manner. The book is good reading. Some of the passages emerge as literary gems.

Although the author claims he “consciously avoided” Montcalm and Wolfe, the classic treatment of this subject by Francis Parkman, no one writing after Parkman’s masterful account can afford to ignore it. Bird does acknowledge his heavy reliance on Parkman-based revisionist studies. He, therefore, owes much more to Parkman than he admits. His account will not replace Parkman’s, but it certainly is an excellent addition to the literature.

The endmap and text maps are clearly drawn and are welcome aids to the text. The illustrations are well chosen and appropriate. A chronology is a useful reference item. Personnel tables and explanatory notes on special units of the British and French military forces and government authorities are helpful. In the absence of footnotes, the acknowledgments and the note on source materials are too brief and inadequate. Unfortunately, the index is not topical or analytical; it contains only names. This severely limits its usefulness.

Miami University, Ohio

Dwight L. Smith


Over the past decade the Weisses have published about a half dozen studies of early industries in New Jersey. This unpretentious volume deals with cedar mining, the manufacture of tar, pitch, and turpentine, and the harvesting of salt hay, of which only the last still lingers in that state.

The authors have consulted a wide variety of accounts relating to these industries. For instance, they have exploited Peter Kalm and Tench Coxe, the Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society, the Boston News-Letter, the Pennsylvania Gazette, personal letters and diaries, and photographs from the Library of Congress collections for their chapter on cedar mining.

Cedar grew in great abundance in swamps in several New Jersey counties and was used for fences, staves, cordwood, and furniture in colonial times. But white cedar was most valuable when cut for shingles; such shingles were durable and light, they absorbed some water, and they allowed this water to evaporate quickly. Cedar mining became an industry in the mid-eighteenth century after the virgin stands had been cut and trees that had
been blown down or died were dug (or “mined”) from the swamps or peat bogs. Using an iron rod, the miner probed the swamp and estimated the size of the trunks found. After he cleared away the earth, matted roots, and muck, the miner cut off both ends of the log and pried it loose with levers. Some trunks were from 200 to 1,000 years old, most were less than thirty feet in length, and many were one and one-half to three feet in diameter. With shingles selling for about sixteen dollars a thousand in the 1870's, a skilled mechanic could mine the logs and hand-make 1,000 shingles a week. However, with the advent of machine-made shingles and with insurance companies requiring fireproof shingles, cedar mining died out as an industry.

Salt hay grew primarily in tide marshes along the Hackensack-Newark meadows, the Atlantic Ocean from Point Pleasant south to Cape May, and the Delaware River and Bay from Salem to Cape May. Used for bedding and cattle feed, it became a profitable commodity for sale in the early nineteenth century and attracted companies of investors. Most prominent were the Hackensack & Passaic Meadow Company, organized by the wealthy Swartwout brothers from New York in 1816, and the New Jersey Salt Meadow Company (1820), among whose stockholders were the Swartwouts and Cadwallader D. Colden. New uses were found for the hay—for layering bananas and mulching strawberry plants, as packing for glassware and pottery, as icehouse insulation, for making paper, and eventually for covering newly-poured concrete during freezing weather—and the industry flourished.

Over the past half century, however, much land formerly profitable for its salt hay has been used for industrial plants, highways, and airports, so that presently only limited cutting is done. Nevertheless, there are several thousand acres of salt hay marshlands in Cumberland, Cape May, Atlantic, and Ocean Counties, and the salt hay cut there is used for bedding for mink ranches, in packing bricks, and for filling archery targets.

Although somewhat uneven in its coverage, this short work is most valuable for the student of local economic history. It adequately complements the authors’ earlier writings.

West Chester State College

ROBERT E. CARLSON


Most histories of the Gettysburg campaign, in describing events leading up to the battle, make but passing reference to such matters as minor military engagements and skirmishes, the farthest point of the Confederate advance, and the impact of the invasion on Pennsylvania. The big exception is Jacob Hoke's Great Invasion, first published in 1877, which because of its comprehensiveness has remained the standard work on these subjects until the present. In this latest account of the rebel invasion of 1863 Colonel Nye has to a certain extent brought Hoke's book up to date, though he writes nothing about the battle and little about the maneuvers of both armies.
as they moved into Pennsylvania. Instead he concentrates on the march of Ewell's corps in the vanguard of the invading forces, cavalry operations along the way, and civilian reactions to the invaders. In his description of the frequent clashes between Confederate and Union forces he pays particular heed to the fights at Aldie, Middleburg, and Upperville which previous writers have barely mentioned.

His major contribution consists of the four chapters devoted to accounts of the battle of Winchester and the little-known brushes at Berryville and Martinsburg, which he describes for the first time from both Northern and Southern points of view. Even several "small-unit" actions usually ignored by historians receive his careful attention, because these little affairs were illustrative of the way the Civil War soldier spent most of his time in combat: a cautious advance, an occasional shot, and then long intervals of waiting for something to happen. Colonel Nye gives equal consideration to the problem of military intelligence. Both sides had difficulty in penetrating the fog of war and divining the real intentions of the enemy, but in his estimation Union leaders were particularly inept in this respect.

By concentrating on filling the gaps left by other historians of the campaign Nye seems to shoot off in many directions without fully developing his various themes and tying them together. He begins with a description of General Robert E. Lee in the winter of 1862-1863 wondering just how he was going to feed his army in the coming months, and then deciding to invade the North in search of food. As the story unfolds Lee fades into the background, while General Ewell and his corps emerge into the spotlight, which then follows their wanderings and fighting almost step by step until they approached Gettysburg on July 1. Though Nye refers to Ewell's successes in getting an abundance of food and other supplies for the Confederate army, he makes no sustained effort to determine whether Lee's gigantic raid could in the long run be pronounced a success, or what it cost the Pennsylvanians. Since the focus is on Ewell's corps, his detailed account of General J. E. B. Stuart's encounters with Union cavalry after Brandy Station and his ride into Pennsylvania seems beside the point.

In the sections of the book describing the movements of the Army of the Potomac and the measures taken to defend Pennsylvania, Nye bears down too heavily in his indictment of Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton and General Henry W. Halleck as war leaders. Stanton's ideas to improve the militia system did have merit, though their execution was poorly timed. Despite his shortcomings Halleck had a better grasp of what to do in the emergency than did General Hooker. It was he, for instance, who suggested that Hooker order the Union cavalry to make a massive reconnaissance of the Virginia Piedmont in search of Lee's army, a move which led to a series of famous cavalry engagements.

Whatever quarrels one may have with Nye's interpretations, he has made a unique and useful contribution to Civil War literature. All through the book he gives the reader the benefit of his years of military training and experience, his keen sense of geography, and his broad knowledge of Civil War history and lore. Colonel Nye obviously had fun writing this book,
for he spent days in traveling over lanes and byways to obscure hamlets, ferreting out the routes once taken by marching columns, and locating their fields of combat. His volume is generously supplied with fifteen of his own beautifully drawn maps, and it could be used as a guide on a Sunday's outing by a Civil War enthusiast who might get deep satisfaction from knowing that on this spot some Confederate soldier took a pot shot at an unwary Yankee militiaman. Certainly there is no longer any doubt about how close the cavalry attached to Ewell's corps came to Harrisburg and what happened when they probed its defenses. He has told the story very well, and hereafter little more needs to be said.

Lafayette College

EDWIN B. CODDINGTON


Pennsylvanians were well aware of events transpiring in the South in 1861-1877, much as they are today conscious of the present struggle for equal rights taking place there. The South was then a focal point of attention and involvement, in the abortive schism of Civil War and the hopeful agony of Reconstruction. Legislative halls in Harrisburg and Washington rang with cries of concern for the Negro people, cries that were gradually submerged beneath a sea of self-interest. To comprehend what that distant clamor was about, as well as to gain insight into today's headlines, one needs to read this careful work of scholarship by Joel Williamson.

The course of the Civil War in South Carolina opens the volume. Here the first of numerous Pennsylvanians treads the stage, Lieutenant Stephen Atkins Swails, of Columbia, one of eight Negro line officers, who was cited for bravery in the celebrated storming of Fort Wagner, later a Freedman's Bureau superintendent and presiding officer of the South Carolina Senate. A survey of Reconstruction in depth shows the Negro people grappling with their new freedom and with those who would wrest it from them. The author demolishes the carpetbagger-scalawag mythology by documenting that “far from being the disaster so often described, Reconstruction was for the Negroes of South Carolina a period of unequalled progress.”

Economic and social transformation in that state is set forth in detail. By the end of Reconstruction, in agriculture the Negro occupied one of four positions: sharecropper, wage laborer, foreman or manager, and landowner. Non-agricultural pursuits, very much the minority, included domestics, skilled and unskilled laborers, business and professional men. Northern missionary efforts to convert the Negro included not a few Pennsylvanians in the South and at home. These sometimes overlapped into the educational field, as in the case of Pennsylvania Quaker Reuben Tomlinson, Superintendent of Education for South Carolina under the Freedman's Bureau. The structuring of a pattern of segregation only now being demolished is delineated with great skill by Williamson, who assesses physical separation of the races as “the most revolutionary change in relations between
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whites and Negroes in South Carolina during Reconstruction." The struggle
for voting rights, culminating in the Fifteenth Amendment, is set forth. One
hopes that its capstone, the recent Voting Rights Bill, does not meet its
fate: "By intimidation and outright fraud and by increasingly stringent elec-
tion laws, the white made the Negro's exercise of his suffrage steadily
more difficult."

Williamson has supplemented Francis B. Simkins's and Robert W.
Woody's long-standard South Carolina During Reconstruction (1932), with
a well researched, well written sequel. Minor flaws, such as making Gen-
eral Rufus B. Saxton a Maine native, are few. The rich harvest of fresh
source materials coupled with skillful synthesis render this a worthy model
for future state studies of Reconstruction. Even in design the book is at-
tractive and a pleasure to use, a worthy credit to the University of North
Carolina Press.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission  DANIEL R. MACGILVRAE

The Rise of Bucknell University. By J. Orin Oliphant. (New York: Apple-

The undersigned has already had his say in Pennsylvania History
(April, 1959) about college histories: they are written, as a general rule, to
please alumni and to serve as public relations vehicles, and therefore should
not be reviewed in journals such as this. Frederick Rudolph, among others,
has been even more caustic in his criticism of the contents of this form
of historiography. Rudolph would like a "serious or penetrating investiga-
tion of the relationship of the university to the goals of the society which
created it" (American Historical Review, LIIX (July, 1954), 1039). Whether
Rudolph would be satisfied with this Bucknell study there is no way of
knowing.

In all candor, Dr. Oliphant's book is definitely better than the ordinary
"official" history which is produced, all too often, to honor the incumbent
president. In the reviewer's opinion it is a superior college history, and
Bucknellians should be proud of the volume. The style is excellent, and so
is the organization. The author writes solidly and sincerely, without em-
ploying any "smart-alec" tactics to attract a reader's attention. It is an
honorable story, honorably told.

The book expands on the theme which, fundamentally, is the theme of
practically all church-founded institutions of higher learning, namely, that
Baptist divines start a college at Lewisburg because the church needs edu-
cated leaders; then, after getting the concern going, the church fails to
provide adequate financial support, expecting the teachers, by working for
pittances, to subsidize both the college and the students until some wealthy
individual (in this case William Bucknell) comes along and saves the ship.
President Loomis once said, "The history of American Colleges has been
a history of financial embarrassment." Here at Susquehanna, we used to put
it another way, although we meant the same thing: "The teachers do an
excellent job educating our students, in spite of having nothing to work
with, in the way of money and equipment.” Is it any wonder that so many church-related colleges have gone secular?

The process of “de-secting” Bucknell continued apace. As years went by, Baptist influences and contributions declined rapidly; the money for the development of the campus since World War II came entirely, or almost entirely, from non-Baptist sources. In 1953 the charter was so amended that only one-fifth of the trustees need be Baptists. By 1958 President Odgers could say that for a long time Bucknell had been “a non-sectarian or interdenominational” college. “Thus,” says the author, “for Bucknell the way was widened to sources of wealth beyond the bounds of the Baptist denomination.” When one visits the magnificent new campus, he cannot keep from wondering what it would be like today if the college had continued to lean upon Baptists for financing.

Improvement in buildings, campus, and equipment was not matched by improvement in faculty salaries. Near the end of President Harris’s remarkable thirty years, which were devoted to rebuilding the physical plant, the Bucknell Alumni Association in March, 1917, was ashamed to find that faculty salaries were “amazingly small.” At Bucknell as late as the spring of 1953 the top salary for full professors was $5,500 per year. Our salary scale at Susquehanna at that time was even lower. There has been considerable raising of compensation at both institutions since 1953, and yet the AAUP Bulletin (June, 1965, p. 291) shows Bucknell with a salary scale averaging about a “C,” and Susquehanna averaging about a “D,” on a scale in which “A” is the highest. Teachers at both places, as well as at many others in the country, are still subsidizing their students. For, if salaries were raised to, say, a scale of “B,” tuition fees would probably have to be so high that many, if not most, students could not afford to be in college.

Historians are likely to laugh at the blurbs on book jackets and to pay no attention to their exaggerations. The following words appear on the dust cover: “The characteristics which endeared Professor J. Orin Oliphant to two generations of Bucknell students are everywhere apparent in the pages of this book: his encyclopedic knowledge of American history; his impeccable scholarship; his mastery of a lucid and graceful style in English prose; and the subtle wit, humor, and irony that made his lectures in the classroom unforgettable.” This time the old rule does not apply; the blurb is both accurate and true. The praise bespeaks the loss suffered by Pennsylvania when Dr. Oliphant retired in 1964 and went to live in his beloved Pacific Northwest. Bucknell lost a teacher of rare ability; the Pennsylvania Historical Association lost a conscientious worker; and all of us lost a good friend.

The only criticism to be lodged against the book is that the footnotes are not where they should be. Those of us who knew Orin Oliphant can well imagine that he lost that battle only after a gallant, last-ditch fight.

Susquehanna University

William A. Russ, Jr.

Dr. Richman's slim volume is more than a mere revision of the similar Works Progress Administration publication of 1939. Into fifty-eight pages of text he has packed a wealth of information concerning the holdings of 105 manuscript depositories in the Keystone State. As explained in the foreword, the field is limited to manuscripts relating to American history, excluding public records and the organizations' own institutional records. This specialization has resulted in fewer entries than in the earlier volume, but, in spite of this, we find twenty-four depositories not previously listed. The latter, I feel, is indicative of the more favorable economic climate prevailing today, plus the greater availability of leisure time; for the newcomers are mainly county historical societies and museums.

The author has followed the format of Hamer's Guide but with considerably more detail. Street addresses of depositories are indicated together with information about the hours of operation and copying services. One change we would like to see in future editions (reference is made to the possibility of such) is the abandonment of the cubic feet method of determining the size of very small holdings. Figures such as .40 cubic feet, and even less, are not particularly significant.

The reviewer, currently engaged in a somewhat similar project, has nothing but admiration for Dr. Richman's results, especially when the magnitude of his task is considered. This was not a field invasion by an army of workers. Instead, Dr. Richman personally visited almost all of the reporting institutions.

Eleutherian Mills Historical Library

Hugh R. Ginn
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY STUDIES

The Pennsylvania Historical Association has available copies of four numbers of the Pennsylvania Historical Studies, including the new booklet by George Swetnam reviewing the history of Pennsylvania Transportation. These Studies will supplement reading assignments in Pennsylvania or American history courses in both colleges and secondary schools. They are valuable guides for libraries, historical societies, museums, and the general reader.

A 20% discount is available for orders of twenty-five or more of the same title.

To order, please complete and detach the form below.

Dr. John B. Frantz
Secretary, The Pennsylvania Historical Association
Department of History
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Enclosed please find a check payable to The Pennsylvania Historical Association in the amount of $.................. for the following numbers of the Pennsylvania History Studies:

......... Gilbert, A Picture of the Pennsylvania Germans ($0.75)
......... Comfort, The Quakers ($0.75)
......... Miller, Pennsylvania's Oil Industry ($0.50)
......... Swetnam, Pennsylvania's Transportation Industry ($0.75)

To be mailed to (PLEASE PRINT):