Can it be that there remains a place for yet another study of William Penn? The bibliography published by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission in 1957 lists some forty books devoted to the Founder, along with much supplementary periodical literature. Since then several significant additional studies have appeared. The wealth of monographic material thus made available would seem to suggest that the time is ripe for the writing of a monumental biography in the tradition of Moneypenny and Buckle, John Morley, and Douglas Southall Freeman, not to mention Carl Van Doren. The subject could surely support such extensive treatment. Yet no one has come forward to attempt this formidable task. The soaring costs of publication have indeed served to discourage studies of great length. Yet the reason here could well be that, all this investigation notwithstanding, William Penn has still remained insufficiently understood. That inner light in the guidance of which he so firmly believed can work in inscrutable ways. It is to the difficult task of explaining the interaction of the mystical and the finite, the ideal and the practical, that Mary Dunn has addressed herself.

One of the requirements of this study has been the exhaustive reading and painstaking analysis of the pamphlet literature which came in such profusion from the hand of William Penn. Indeed it was necessary first to establish a sound bibliography, for problems of authorship had to be resolved. This material has of course been examined countless times, but it may well be doubted if any earlier scholar has employed it as skillfully as has Mrs. Dunn to demonstrate the evolution of Penn's attitudes, an evolution which seems to have been occasioned less by deviation from fundamental objectives than by changing circumstances. Just the same the courageous, if at times doctrinaire, stand of the younger Penn is both more edifying and more consistent than the opportunistic attitude of the mature man of affairs who, while the haven of his objectives may well have remained constant, is continually trimming his sails to the shifting winds.

The careful investigation which has here been made into the antecedents of the early constitutional provisions for the government of Pennsylvania serves to explain a number of things which might otherwise be incomprehensible. Ideals which, if not acquired from Harrington, Penn at least held in common with him, make more understandable both the unwieldy size of the first legislature and Penn's persistent reluctance to allow the lower house the privilege of legislative initiative. Early liberal intentions of Penn
seem to have been modified in the light of suggestions from more conservative collaborators. In an age where wealth, wisdom, and virtue were readily blended in men's minds, it is perhaps remarkable that Penn's early Frames of Government were as liberal as they were. At that, they were to prove not sufficiently so to meet the political aspirations of the colonists.

That most paradoxical facet of Penn's career, his relationship to James II, may still elude full explanation, but under the author's well-reasoned analysis it becomes much less of an enigma. The circumstances surrounding the appointment of John Blackwell as Governor have long baffled the understanding. Penn sent him out to take a strong hand in the affairs of the colony, but undermined this authoritarian attempt by assuring Thomas Lord that if unacceptable to the colonists he would be "laid aside." This, of course, made the failure of Blackwell's mission, all too likely in any case, a foreordained certainty. Why was Penn guilty of this colossal blunder? One suspects that the answer would afford an illuminating insight into his character. However, the issue is not raised here. Perhaps it is asking too much that a work which explains so many things should also explain this.

All in all, this splendid little book is clear evidence that, intensively though the ground which it covers has been tilled, the soil is still capable of yielding a rich crop to the skilled and diligent cultivator.

University of Pennsylvania.

LEONTDAS DODSON


In an important and timely book J. R. Pole has assumed the difficult task of tracing the origins and development of majority rule in England and America from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth century. He makes a substantial contribution to the growing body of literature of the intellectual aspects of the American Revolution, an event which takes a central place in his work.

Pole begins his five-part study with a survey of the Old Whigs, Harrington, Sidney and Locke, examines the contribution each made to the idea of representative government, moves on to the aggrandizement of colonial assemblies and their final triumph over councils and governors, and considers the beginning of majority rule in America after the Revolution. He next turns to compare the slow birth of political individualism and concludes with a "Comparative Dimension," a provocative analysis of his findings.

The Old Whig claim that legislatures should hold supreme power over the Crown or executive, a claim that gained the status of a dogma in the colonies by the 1760's, became a reality with the Declaration of Independence. By 1776 representative assemblies had successfully asserted their control over the executive branch and fulfilled the great Whig tradition of "the good old cause." Yet if the break with England proved that legislatures were supreme, it opened the equally significant question of who should rule at
Pole maintains that powerful commercial coalitions of “interests” ultimately gained control over legislatures, in part, because of their concentration in cities. This was most evident in the declaration of the affluent Massachusetts county of Essex in 1776. The “Essex Result” set forth the doctrine that government acts separately upon persons and property; both had to receive protection. If laws affect persons, consent of the majority was sufficient; but if it affects property, those who hold the majority should have the stronger voice. Lower houses would represent the popular majority while upper houses would protect the rights of property or “interests.” Massachusetts used the “Essex Result” to justify its bicameral system, and the doctrine soon became a tenet of political thought throughout the nation. When the federal Constitution was written this view prevailed, for it was thought that states which retained the right to choose senators would protect the rights of property. But as majority rule became more dominant, Pole believes the different interests which the two houses represented began to blur. Similar tendencies appeared in Great Britain.

The Glorious Revolution established the independence and security of Parliament, yet it failed to use its new freedom to open itself to popular influences. The House of Commons moved instead toward a landed oligarchy and strengthened its security by privacy of debate and legislation such as the Septennial Act of 1716, which prevented the electorate from expressing itself with the frequency it had in former times. Pole shows forces at work, however, which prevented the oligarchy from stifling political liberty and ensured that the system remained open to change. Left-wing Whigs, disciples of Harrington, carried on seventeenth-century ideas, wealthy “nabobs” of the East India trade who pushed up the price of seats in the House, and the persistent discontent in the City of London all played a part in keeping Parliament from becoming a closed corporation.

According to Pole one of the most significant factors in extending representation in Britain was the development of a free press. From the mid-1760s until final victory in 1771 the press attempted to print Parliament’s debates. Crises such as the Wilkes affair and growing colonial hostility aroused great interest in Parliament’s activities. The demand for news became irresistible; the Government bowed to public opinion. Once debates were freely and openly reported, the electorate was in a position to judge whether its members were truly representing its interests. Following close in the wake of expanded news coverage went the doctrine of instruction (which Burke attempted to discourage in his Address to the Bristol merchants), and a gradual increase in the House’s sense of public accountability for its own conduct. Parliament’s loss of privacy amounted, in short, “to a profound modification in the Constitution.”

Though political individualism received new stimulus from Utilitarians who favored universal suffrage, Whig reformers under Grey recognized that politics is the art of the possible and presented their great Reform Act of 1832. This Act in Pole’s opinion expanded interest rather than individual representation, for it attached commercial, industrial and professional middle classes to the Constitution. Yet Whigs broadened the concept of interest
to include public opinion, which became a permanent and legitimate force. But even after universal suffrage was finally achieved, interest representation in the form of disciplined, well-organized lobbies would continue to wield great influence among lawmakers on both sides of the Atlantic.

In a work of this scope it is inevitable that errors should appear, though they are remarkably few. It is doubtful, for instance, that Virginia's House of Burgesses extended suffrage in 1762 to make the back-country more attractive to settlers. Nor did English merchants support a paper currency for America. Indeed, the contrary was true, for British commercial interests were responsible for the restrictive Currency Act of 1764. Pole's use of pamphlet literature is also questionable. Mere publication is unconvincing proof of a pamphlet's popularity or contribution to intellectual currents. But these are minor points and do not detract from the book. More serious is his view of the Revolution. Ignoring vital ideological-constitutional aspects of the struggle, he stresses various "interests" or economic groups' grasp for power.

Both author and publisher deserve accolades for offering an attractive book. There are few serious typographical errors, footnotes are properly placed, and Mr. Pole has supplied an impressive bibliography and an appendix of voting statistics in America.

Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh

Robert J. Chaffin


With Douglas Edward Leach's antecedent volume in the Histories of the American Frontier series, Dr. Sosin's present work covers most of the period of Pennsylvania frontier history; a forthcoming volume, The Trans-Appalachian Frontier, 1783-1815, should complete the coverage.

Subdivision of a broad subject is not easy and is usually somewhat arbitrary, and one might ask why the division between Colonial and Revolutionary frontier has been made at 1763. Dr. Sosin defends this dating on the ground that the Peace of Paris opened the way for British development of a frontier policy that was pursued until the Revolution and then adopted by the Confederation. Other students might prefer and defend some different division of the subject.

The settlement of an Indian boundary in the 1760's, the establishment of white settlements west of the mountains, and military actions before and during the Revolution are recounted in considerable factual detail, and the accounts necessarily range over a wide territory. The first of these topics in particular cries for a map, and all might have been clarified, and some textual detail spared, by use of effective maps. The ten maps included in the book are inadequate for identification of places named and seem poorly related to the text. A map of "The United States in 1783," on page xiii, would not be very useful even if it were accurate. The thirteen illustrations, unlisted, are pleasantly reproduced and appropriate, though they, too, are not integrated with the text.
Inevitably, perhaps, not all of the factual statements are accurate. The Indian situation as described on page 5 fits 1775 much better than about 1750; Wyandot and Huron are recognized as synonymous on page 5, but not on page 57; Wapatomic (page 86) and Wokitomike (page 140) are the same name. One might go from Lancaster to York by way of Harris' Ferry (page 44) but the author probably had Wright's Ferry in mind. The statement that the Forbes Road "began at Bedford, [and] passed through Raystown" (page 45) misplaces the eastern end of the road and overlooks the fact that Raystown and Bedford were the same place. December 14, 1763, was the date of the Paxton Boys' first massacre (page 9), and their victims were not "Christian Delawares" (page 83). A sample of tobacco-ad English ("Like the Roman Legions had done . . ." page 45), is not typical of the book's literary style, but there are enough typographic errors, mis-spellings, and lapses of style to suggest the desirability of more careful and thorough proofreading.

It may not be irrelevant to mention two points of usage. The first is that the name for the eighteenth-century immigrants from Ulster is Scotch-Irish, as spelled by themselves and their contemporaries (John Armstrong, James Logan) and in the names of associations formed by their nineteenth-century descendants. The second, the suppression of plural forms of the (Indian) names of Indian tribes, is a somewhat different matter. As a device for preserving native names inviolate in ethnological writings, this practice may have some value, but in normal English prose it is awkward and annoying. A considerable proportion of the accepted names for our Indian tribes were not those used by the groups themselves, moreover, but terms, not always complimentary, which white men learned from neighboring groups and adjusted to fit the sound patterns of one or another European language. Mohawk ("man eater") is just as foreign to the tribe commonly so designated as Delaware is to the people known by that name. The author himself, it may be noted, uses normal plural forms (Chickamaugas, Munseys) for at least two Indian names.

The final three chapters of the book, dealing with land policy, government and law, and economy and society, are less replete with data than the preceding ones and lean more to evaluation and summary. In general the author believes that the institutions and standards of the transmontane settlers did not differ greatly from those of the eastern settlements, except that, the country being new, they were less well established. He notes, however, that the availability of land did enable a larger proportion of freemen to rise to the status of landowner.

In addition to the 192-page text and maps and illustrations as noted, the present volume includes 18 pages of notes, a 14-page bibliographical essay, and a 17-page selective index. The binding of the paperback is insubstantial, the paper satisfactory, the type clear.

It should be noted that Douglas Edward Leach's antecedent volume in this series, as reviewed in the April, 1967, issue of Pennsylvania History, was a clothbound book, 6" x 9" page size, priced at $5.75. The volume presently reviewed has a glued-on paper cover, a page size just under
5" x 7½", and sells for $2.95. Presumably this means that the volumes in this series are available in either format, though this point has not been made clear.

_Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission_   _WILLIAM A. HUNTER_


With this volume, thirteenth in the series on _The British Empire Before the American Revolution_, Professor Gipson brings the narrative part of his magnificent story to an end. Volume XIV, devoted entirely to bibliography, remains to be issued, and it is in preparation. It appears very likely that Gipson will complete the project which he staked out for himself over forty years ago. Thus he will accomplish what Channing, Osgood, Beer, Andrews and nearly every other great American historian since Bancroft failed to consummate. If Professor Gipson does nothing more than finish this epic work he will have created an enduring monument for himself in the groves of Academe.

Of course, this indefatigable Lehigh University professor has done much more than compose some 6,500 pages of intelligible prose on a grand theme in American history. As a part of the entire study begun and developed in the preceding dozen volumes of the series, this thirteenth installment of Gipson's _magnum opus_ continues to inspire a genuine sense of awe at the prodigious research and the mastery of materials which it represents. As a book standing alone, however, without reference to the volumes preceding it (a grossly unfair way to consider it, as a matter of fact) one would have to call Volume XIII a disappointing, disjointed book. In the first place, it is really three short books thrown together without any essential bond of union. Part I consists of eleven chapters on "The Empire Beyond the Storm, 1770-1775," dealing with British overseas possessions, from Ireland and India to Labrador and Jamaica, which did not join the thirteen continental colonies in rebellion against George III. Why did they not? Gipson touches upon this point in discussing slavery in the West Indies or economic dependence in Nova Scotia, but it is not his central theme. The continuing loyalty of more than half of the "Old Empire" is with him a basic assumption, and he treats the economic effect of the Continental Association upon the Caribbean Islands and Nova Scotia in the same imperial framework that embraces the fiscal relationships between the United East India Company and Parliament. I feel that more than this is needed. In their quarrel with Governor Lyttelton over their parliamentary privileges, the members of the Jamaica Assembly indulged in language as provocative as anything ever uttered by Patrick Henry, yet the islanders accepted the Stamp Act with exemplary calm. The reasons for this, and for the ultimate nonbelligerence of Bermuda, Nova Scotia and Quebec, as well, require more study than Gipson has allotted them, and this is a regrettable weakness in his great work.
Yet I hasten to acknowledge that in Part II of his book, a “Summary of the Series,” Gipson in three tightly written pages (206-208) explains “Why parts of the Empire did not revolt” with arguments that may be completely satisfactory to most readers—economic dependence, geographical exposure, and military weakness. This 53-page “Summary” is more than a mere condensation of the earlier twelve volumes—it is a lucid and persuasive exposition of the sweep of history in the Atlantic community for a quarter of a century and of all of Gipson’s earlier studies in this field. To the end he remains an apologist for the Old British Empire, and confesses in somewhat nostalgic prose that whether or not the independence of the United States was inevitable is still a question in his mind.

Part III, “Historiographical Sketches Relating to the History of the British Empire, 1748-1776,” is a puzzling if not an irrelevant addition which takes up half the space in the book. The usefulness of a 227-page essay on the historiography of this period may not be denied, but Professor Gipson has cast it into the form of biographical and critical essays on sixty-two English, Canadian and American historians who have, over the last two centuries, dealt with this period of history, in some cases only incidentally. His technique involves much repetition and relatively unimportant biographical detail. It also rests upon a selective process which excludes at least a dozen American historians, such as McIlwain, Morison, Wright, Morris and Jensen who are as much entitled to a place as are Wertenbaker, Miller, Brown and others treated by Gipson. Agreement on whom to include in such lists is, of course, impossible.

One thing, however, is certain. No future compiler of such lists will dare to ignore the name and work of Lawrence Henry Gipson. One who has read his entire series as each volume appeared over the last four decades must come to these final pages with a sense of having finished some final, irrevocable voyage over a broad and far-flung ocean.

Otterbein College

LYNN W. TURNER


Professor Schofield, who teaches at the Case Institute of Technology, is probably the leading authority on Joseph Priestley’s scientific work, having previously published a number of articles on this subject, a new edition of Priestley’s History of Electricity, and a study of the Lunar Society of Birmingham. Now he has collected and made available 180 letters and documents relating to Priestley’s scientific research, gathered from more than thirty different manuscript depositories scattered over Europe and the United States. The selection is approximately twice as large as the similar one published by Henry C. Bolton in 1892. The collection is occasionally filled out with some portions of Priestley’s Memoirs.
Schofield's editorial apparatus is minimal. The original spelling, punctuation, and paragraphing of the letters have been left unchanged. There are no explanatory notes identifying unfamiliar persons and terms mentioned in the letters. The fact that Priestley's chemical terminology was completely different from that in use today will make this a real handicap for all but specialists in the history of science. There is an appendix giving brief biographical sketches of Priestley's correspondents, and the editor has also supplied a running commentary on the letters. The latter, however, is presented after each group of letters rather than before. Also included are a comprehensive list of Priestley's scientific publications, arranged in chronological order, a general bibliography of related writings, and an extensive index.

The book is divided into six chapters. The first one gives a brief introduction to Priestley's education and background. The second deals chiefly with his electrical experiments and his History of Electricity (1767), published when Priestley was thirty-four years old and while he was teaching at the Warrington Academy. Chapter III deals with his work while pastor at Leeds, covering his invention of a process for carbonating water, his history of optics (1772), and his earliest "Observations on Different Kinds of Air." In 1773 Priestley left the ministry, his favorite occupation, and became librarian and companion to Lord Shelburne. During the next seven years he made his most notable contributions to chemistry, including the discovery of oxygen and other gases and studies of the process of photosynthesis; these are the main themes of the fourth chapter.

In 1781 he returned to the ministry as a Unitarian pastor in Birmingham. Ten years later his house, his library, and his laboratory were destroyed by a mob aroused over his radical political and religious views. Chapter V, on this period, is called "On the Defensive." The final chapter deals with Priestley's last decade, spent in Northumberland, Pennsylvania. During these years he continued his chemical experiments as well as his theological writing. He was offered the professorship of chemistry at the University of Pennsylvania and the presidency of the American Philosophical Society, but he turned down both invitations. Until the end of his life he defended the ancient phlogiston theory, which his own work had contributed to overthrow.

Schofield is somewhat critical of Priestley's scientific ability, at one point remarking that "nowhere in his discussions does he reveal that analytical interplay of observation and theory which characterizes the superlatively great scientist." At another point, however, he pays tribute to Priestley's "integrity and courage."

Pennsylvanians may be particularly interested in Priestley's correspondence with Franklin, Rush, and Benjamin Smith Barton.

*Ira V. Brown*

This is a provocative, one might even say an exciting title and theme for the promised vistas it portrays of the little known world of early technology in our country. References to published source material fairly drip from the sentences in the bibliography section, and, in the Directory of Artifact Collections, a beginning is made toward a guide to where associated real objects may be found. The book is divided into three distinct sections: an essay, "The Exhilaration of Early American Technology," and "A Bibliography of Early American Technology" are by Brooke Hindle; a "Directory of Artifact Collections" by Lucius F. Ellsworth forms the third and closing section.

Section one, "The Exhilaration of Early American Technology," asks many questions, points out many pitfalls, examines many different departures and points of view, touches on newly developed historical and research techniques, and throws in a good measure of caution on the use and reliance that can be placed, for example, on such seemingly positive records as patents and commission reports. All facets of the problem of developing detailed technical history are explored but the conclusions on where and how to proceed are left to the reader. This is perhaps necessary in a book of this nature, although some of the least experienced readers seeking guidance might like to have the opportunities made plainer for them. As it is they may come away a little dazed by the kaleidoscopic adventure without having experienced the guidance expected. The many new workers in this rapidly growing field of serious historical interest will appreciate the thumbnail sketches of development in various fields before moving on to the second or bibliographic section. Before departing it is to be hoped that an attitude of enlightened questioning will have been absorbed, for that is the true message of the author. An excellent recommendation is made that the researcher cultivate a zest and enthusiasm toward historical achievements equal to the spirit that animated the original innovator reveling in his work.

The bibliography has two purposes—to identify the chief works on technology in America before 1850, and to outline the chief areas of the history of technology together with the work accomplished in each. Opening with a survey of guides and sources, the "Contributions to Bibliography in the History of Technology" by Eugene S. Ferguson, is the main offering which provides classification and commentary on broad topics and on specific titles. Historians isolated from the catalog of an extensive library, and from the Ferguson bibliography which has been serialized in Technology and Culture, will certainly find this narrative bibliography indispensable even though not completely reliable. For example, on page 72 we read "An American manual which also reveals some of the secrets of the trade is Thomas Reid, A Treatise on Clock and Watchmaking (Philadelphia, 1832)"; this is actually an American edition of a well-known British work that went through many
editions in England. In the same paragraph there is reference to *A History of Simon Willard, Inventor and Clockmaker*, with a date of 1860 given, whereas the correct date is 1911.

 Manuscript and business records and some of the better sources for them are included before the text is broken down into types of industry and related historical sources. These are fantastically rich in references to published sources. Unfortunately, however, both these publications and the comments on them are of an uneven quality. To this extent the really carefully prepared works possessing deep insight into their subjects are lost among other works having all the appearances of quality but whose authors were so limited by time, background, or otherwise, that their studies are unreliable. Perhaps the best way to describe the bibliography would be to say that it is made up of short historical sketches containing references to further reading and evaluation.

 The “Directory of Artifact Collections” by Ellsworth was compiled chiefly from the responses to nearly four hundred questionnaires mailed out, nearly half of which drew a response. The larger and most generalized museums, roughly bounded by Virginia, Michigan and Massachusetts, were personally visited. Descriptions of both these and those institutions surveyed only by questionnaire are quite inadequate and do not serve to convey the depth and variety of collections available in most cases. Perhaps a clearer overall picture might have been presented if it had been possible to let the larger museums speak for themselves, and to have visited and evaluated those museums with smaller staffs or where collections have received relatively less study. This would have been a task of impossible magnitude for one individual, so perhaps we have here the most reasonable compromise combined with a beginning to a valuable guide.

 Material objects have qualities very difficult to describe by publication—such qualities as intimate details of archaic manufacturing processes, operating characteristics, and aesthetic values. These are not readily brought to life on the printed page. If the student is to acquire any real sense of participation or alliance with the objects of the past and with the individuals who made and used them, artifacts are indispensable. The opportunity offered here for the student to approach technical history from something approximating the vantage point of the practitioner is a tremendous advance over the purely literary book-learning point of view. This is in accord with Mr. Hindle’s injunction on page 28, “to get inside the men, their tools, and their works.”

 Seen as a unit the book may be likened to a series of classroom lectures intended to stimulate interest, guide students toward broader horizons, and to encourage an approach to history as a living, vibrant recovery of the spirit of the creative times under study. The value of the book will be relative to the interests and background of the reader but it contains something even for those long experienced in the history of technology.

*Smithsonian Institution*  
*Edwin A. Battison*

This unusual but significant contribution to United States naval history is concerned primarily with reforms affecting enlisted men and it investigates three major areas: (1) efforts to create a career personnel composed of native-born Americans; (2) the use and abuse of corporal punishment, the euphemism for flogging; and (3) the alcohol problem. The volume is thus a laudable supplement to the important work of Charles O. Paullin on the history of naval administration which appeared over fifty years ago as a series of articles in the U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings.

This study begins with the establishment of the Navy Department shortly after the inauguration of President John Adams, the moving spirit of the Continental Navy, following four uncertain years for the new naval service under the jurisdiction of the War Department. It ends on September 1, 1862 with the abolition of the liquor ration on order of Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles. This reform had come largely through the efforts of Gustavus V. Fox, the Assistant Secretary and a former naval officer, and James W. Grimes, the inland Senator from Iowa who succeeded in getting enacted so much beneficial legislation for the Navy.

The manning of warships did not become a serious problem until about ten years after the War of 1812. The reason for it was that Americans, especially New Englanders, no longer had to go to sea to make a living, for that war had opened up the West. Their places were taken in increasing numbers by foreigners. Repeated attempts to induce native-born young men of good character to enlist through inland recruiting and the establishment of an apprentice system all failed. The situation remained critical until two decades after the Civil War when the new steam and steel Navy was finally "Americanized," mainly through the efforts of Stephen B. Luce.

It is difficult to learn whether the cause was refusal of native-born youth to serve or the unattractive conditions on the lower decks which deterred them. In any case, to induce enlistments of the poor material available the liquor ration was believed necessary, and corporal punishment was employed to maintain order and discipline thousands of miles from the United States. Congress, with little interest in the Navy, was apathetic to humanitarian appeals. Langley summarizes: "It was only when naval officers of proven ability joined in the cries for reform that the measures received more serious consideration."

If Langley's work has a deficiency, it is his failure to analyze the discreditable officer situation as perhaps the basic cause. In a service with neither selection for promotion nor retirement, the young heroes of 1812 continued for decades to rule the Navy according to the whims of old men. Charles Stewart, the twenty-six-year-old captain of the Constitution in 1815, was still on active duty in 1860 as commandant of the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Junior officers with little prospect of promotion were either insubordinate or apathetic and many were addicted to liquor. Drinking among officers, which was not controlled, was more serious than among enlisted men.
The Mexican War, the acquisition of California, and trade with the Far East finally aroused Congressional interest in the Navy. Moreover, a group of able officers were rising to prominence, among them M. C. Perry, Du Pont, Maury, and especially the temperance advocate, Andrew H. Foote. Flogging was finally abolished by law in 1850, mainly through the efforts of Senator Stockton of New Jersey, a former naval officer. Instead of the chaos that many predicted, this was followed by measures which improved the men's welfare such as honorable discharges, benefits for continuous service, and more leave and liberty. And in 1855 an enlightened disciplinary code was enacted which gave ship commanders court martial authority and wider choice of punishments. This code governed shipboard life for almost a full century.

The abolition of grog was accepted with mixed feelings. Some worthy officers felt that it had helped keep in the Navy men who, though social outcasts ashore, were nevertheless excellent man-of-war's men. But G. V. Fox was no doubt nearer the truth with his remark to Grimes: "All insubordination, all misery, every deviltry on board ships can be traced to rum."

Langley records all this in interesting and documented detail. The book has a good index which will add to its reference life but the bibliography is the usual norm of a Ph.D. dissertation, a long, tiresome listing of all material run across during research, with neither annotation nor appraisal. Langley's excellent footnotes, however, provide his real bibliography and the publisher is to be commended for placing them on the same page with the material to which they refer.

It is to be hoped that Professor Langley will continue his unique investigations into the next century of United States naval history.

Annapolis

JOHN D. HAYES


The publication of the Fisher diary, almost a century after its completion, is in itself an important literary event. Bequeathed by Fisher to his son and passed down through the family, the diary was presented to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania in 1948 by R. Sturgis Ingersoll. Excerpts from it began to appear four years later in the Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, but although they ran through twenty-four issues of the magazine, the part published was only a small fraction of the original. The diary in book form contains nearly all the material that came out in serial form and perhaps as much as 20 percent more. This is unquestionably one of the three or four most significant American diaries for the period it covers that has yet been published, significant in terms of its historical value and literary quality.

The first entry begins in August, 1834 when Fisher was twenty-five years old, living on South 7th Street in Philadelphia. After the early death of
his parents, who belonged to the city's upper class, Sidney and his two younger brothers were reared by a spinster aunt who saw to it that he was educated at a private boarding school in Germantown and at Dickinson College. Although he had inherited a modest fortune, including an ancestral farm in Maryland, and preferred the life of a gentleman farmer, Fisher read law under Joseph Ingersoll and qualified for the Philadelphia Bar about the time he became of age. Disliking law practice and having a marked distaste for both public life and business, Fisher became more and more absorbed in reading, writing, lecturing, and other leisure-time pursuits. After his marriage in 1851 to Elizabeth Ingersoll, his inability to operate his farm profitably and his tendency to live beyond his means caused him to become more preoccupied with his financial problems.

To Fisher it was obligatory to live according to the concept of a gentleman that had been passed down to him from his forbears. Probably the standards of a Proper Philadelphian of the mid-nineteenth century were not greatly different from those of a Proper Bostonian or New Yorker. Fisher was disturbed, however, by the "vulgarity, meanness, & ostentatious parade of parvenuism" which he regarded as characteristic of New York society and which he saw creeping in to the old family society of Philadelphia as early as the 1830's. Fisher's status as a gentleman caused him to revere the past, especially the past accomplishments of his ancestors, to restrict his social contacts to members of his own class, to be properly mindful of family ties, and follow the dictates of noblesse oblige. His disinclination to pursue a public career was to some extent a Philadelphia class attitude, but not so of his aspiration to lead a life of leisure. There was a traditional emphasis on the "Protestant ethic" of hard work and on the virtue of living within one's income in the Philadelphia of his day that caused Fisher's friends and even some members of his family to look askance upon his tendency to dream his life away.

Although much of the diary relates to matters that were of personal concern to the author, the record of historical events and Fisher's comment about them makes it an invaluable historical source. Fisher mentions and describes with considerable skill such local happenings as the fire of 1839 (the greatest that Philadelphia had experienced up to that time), the nativist riots of 1844 in Philadelphia, and the cholera epidemic of 1849; the financial distress resulting from the panics of 1837 and 1857; various shocking railroad accidents of the period; the oil boom in western Pennsylvania (which strangely enough he never referred to until six years after the first oil strike at Titusville); and the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson. So greatly did the Civil War color his thinking that he expressed concern lest his diary become little else than a record of the events of the war.

The social historian will find information here about the changes in upper-class manners and living arrangements that occurred during Fisher's lifetime. He gives caustic descriptions of the numerous prominent individuals with whom he came in contact; he mirrors the social life of the Philadelphia aristocracy at private parties and balls and at summer resorts like Newport and Saratoga Springs, where Philadelphia aristocrats as-
associated with their social equivalents in intercity upper-class neighborhoods. There and elsewhere at one time or another, Fisher met and exchanged opinions with prominent Whig statesmen like Clay and Webster; leading writers such as Cooper, Longfellow, N. P. Willis, and the Englishman Anthony Trollope; the historian George Bancroft; the actor Charles Kean; and the affable gentleman, who had the reputation of being Boston's social arbiter, Harrison Gray Otis. Fisher's anti-democratic prejudices strongly influenced his evaluation of the public men about whom he wrote, especially during the Jacksonian period. Historians of Pennsylvania also may be surprised by the indications Fisher gives that flagrant municipal corruption in Philadelphia antedated the Civil War by several years rather than being a product of the war.

The two diaries most comparable to Fisher's are those of George Templeton Strong and Philip Hone, which, in a New York setting, cover much the same time span as *A Philadelphia Perspective*. Both Fisher and Strong were of patrician birth, high principled, nativistic in their attitudes toward foreign immigrants, and interested in a wide range of cultural activities. In its degree of objectivity (in those areas where its author was not personally involved) and in its awareness of the probable course of future events, Fisher's diary is unexcelled by either of its great counterparts.

Not the least of the admirable features of this book is its careful and imaginative editing. An enormous amount of research must have gone into the explanatory notes, which add much to the interest and clarity of Fisher's jottings. Other elements that display the editor's craftsmanship are a somewhat brief preface and epilogue, a chart of family relationships and county seats near Philadelphia, a fine group of beautiful black and white illustrations from a variety of sources, and a good index. Conceivably the index could have been made more useful to scholars by the inclusion of a subject entry for the diarist himself.

It is entirely possible that Sidney Fisher was one of the high-born Philadelphians whose conversations the German-American Francis Grund recorded in his travel book of the 1830's, *Aristocracy in America*. Yet Fisher does not mention Grund, even though the latter edited a Philadelphia newspaper in later life, and so we shall probably never know whether the two men ever met. One can be sure, nevertheless, that Fisher would have been highly pleased with Nicholas Wainwright's edition of his diary, with its beautiful appearance and handsome typography that would have made it a fitting companion of the other fine books that graced the shelves of the diarist's library at Forest Hill.

*Chatham College*  

J. CUTLER ANDREWS


Nathaniel Chapman was one of those men prominent in his own generation whose stature is curiously inexplicable to the historian. Occupant for
many years of the most important chair in America's most important pre-bellum medical school—the chair of practice at the University of Pennsylvania—he was elected the first president of the American Medical Association and died full of wealth and honors. Yet Dr. Chapman was a man of no great originality or flair. As the author demonstrates, a study of his medical writings discloses at best a stubborn diligence, at worst an equally stubborn adherence to tradition. His personal characteristics included a goodly share of opportunism and vindictiveness.

This is surely a biographical challenge, a challenge compounded by the fact that almost no substantial body of Chapman papers has been preserved. In the face of this biographical dilemma—a subject elusive and in some ways unpleasant in character, of limited scientific attainment but great social accomplishment—Dr. Richman has done extraordinary work in unearthing as much material as he has concerning Chapman's life and the milieu of pre-bellum medical and social Philadelphia. Unfortunately, he has not been able to overcome his formidable handicaps. Chapman emerges as an extremely thin and not terribly likable careerist—and one is left wondering about the processes through which professional status was assigned, the institutional mechanisms through which Chapman achieved such remarkable success. Clearly marriage and social connections were one factor; another of course was Chapman's highly ambitious personality.

Perhaps the most satisfactory way in which to have handled this biographical chore would have been to have used Chapman's career as a means of providing insight into the controlling assumptions of his medical generation; but here, I fear, the author has been too modest and the sections describing Chapman's medical concepts are not sufficiently elaborate and analytical to illuminate these assumptions. In sum, Richman deserves commendation for writing an interesting and arresting brief biography of a figure whose inherent elusiveness might well have discouraged a more fainthearted historian.

University of Pennsylvania

CHARLES ROSENBERG


While library shelves groan under the weight of the volumes written on the American Revolution, the ages of Jefferson and Jackson, and the Civil War, the decades of the thirties and the forties remain almost neglected. Uninspiring presidents from Polk to Buchanan and a heretofore general obscurcation of the Negroes' proper place in our history have created this condition. This has been reflected in the graduate programs of most universities which have also contributed to this imbalance. But recently there is evidence of renewed interest in the work of such scholars as Charles G. Sellers, William W. Freehling, and Holman Hamilton. This glimmering is apparent in Chaplain W. Morrison's Democratic Politics and Sectionalism,
the first full-length study of the proviso offered by the Pennsylvania congressman David Wilmot

Professor Morrison describes the attempts made in the 1840's to deal with the problem of slavery in the territories which led to Wilmot's proviso. Presented in the form of an amendment to a bill creating funds for opening peace negotiations in 1846, the Proviso would have restricted slavery in all lands acquired from Mexico as a result of the war. Mr. Morrison's main interest is in how the various factions within the Democratic party reacted to Wilmot's suggested solution. Van Burenites and party regulars; Hunkers and Barnburners; Northerners and Southerners all had to face the challenge created by the Proviso. The presidential race of 1848 was before them, and the nominating conventions were soon to meet. At stake were not only local and national political power, but the very core of the Constitution. A new balance between North and South had been forged in the bloody fires of expansionism threatening each section's way of life.

What the extreme Southern wing of the party wanted was a complete repudiation of the Proviso, while the Northern factions had to pacify increasing free-soil sentiments. Compromise solutions such as James Buchanan's suggested expansion of the Missouri Compromise line, or Lewis Cass's principle of popular sovereignty were both unacceptable to John C. Calhoun and William Yancey, leaders of the southern sectionals. When Cass was nominated the Democracy in the South refused to support his candidacy. This, along with the Barnburner defection and their eventual union with the Free-Soilers, cost the party the election. This defeat in 1848, writes Professor Morrison, "presaged the ultimate failure of the Democratic popular sovereignty solution of the territorial dispute," and ended in civil war.

But why had the South and North arrived at such an irreconcilable position when both recognized that the territories could not possibly support slavery? This is answered in Morrison's important Chapter IV, "The Meaning of the Wilmot Proviso to the General Public." The opposing sides in the struggle found their very way of life and particular social systems threatened. Added to this was growing racial fear and hatred. Antithetical positions reached by North and South based on very unreal economic assumptions, had no chance of compromise with the very real psychological and sociological ills of their societies.

While none of this is strikingly new, it does cast much light on the problems faced by the political structures in the ante-bellum period, and adds perspective to the work begun twenty years ago by Roy F. Nichols in his *The Disruption of American Democracy*. The weaknesses in style (the book reads like a dissertation), lack of bibliography, and generally unappealing format of the volume are the fault of the publishers. But Professor Morrison must bear the blame for failing to place his work into the broader historiographical picture of the period. Despite his impressive array of cited articles and books, he has left out others which would have been useful, e.g., no mention is given of Charles G. Sellers's work on Polk, nor of his important article, "Travail of Slavery." Another question arises
as to why the Whig party escaped the careful scrutiny meted out to its opponents.

But these are minor objections to what is a valuable book. Mr. Morrison has skillfully handled vast amounts of source materials and has produced a clear picture of political machinations in a trying time of crisis.

Occidental College

NORMAN S. COHEN


With this volume the publication of a definitive edition of the papers of the twenty-eighth President is begun. For almost a decade Professor Link and his associates have been sifting and winnowing the vast corpus of printed and manuscript materials by or relating to Wilson. Since it would have been impossible as well as pointless to include every document, the editors determined to print all of Wilson’s important letters, articles, speeches, interviews, and public papers, as well as those of his incoming letters which contribute to the record of his thought and activities.

The editors have done their work well and discreetly. Editorial notes are judiciously inserted where necessary; footnotes briefly identify persons, places, and things; and the character and location of each document is indicated by symbols. The documentary record, however, is allowed to speak for itself with a minimum of interruptions. The editors are content to have the reader arrive at his own interpretations. The high standard of editorial craftsmanship of this volume bodes well for the entire enterprise.

The first entry in Volume I is the record of the birth of Thomas Woodrow on December 28, 1856 from the Wilson family Bible; the last is a notice of Wilson’s withdrawal from the University of Virginia in December, 1880 for reasons of ill health. The record is sparse up to September, 1875, when Wilson entered Princeton College, but thereafter the editors had a rich variety of sources to draw upon: letters to and from family and friends; a diary; marginal notes; a commonplace book; college notebooks; minutes of collegiate societies; manuscript and printed speeches and essays. While in college Wilson was an articulate participant in literary and debating activities; happily, many of his contributions have survived. Most interesting is the shorthand diary which Wilson kept for a number of months.

One regrets the sparsity of documentation for Wilson’s early years, but the formative influences which shaped his character can be surmised from the evidence at hand. He emerges from these pages as a high-minded, serious, Christian gentleman. Wilson may have been typical of his peers in his concern for upright and gentlemanly conduct, but he was uncommon in his zeal for self-improvement, his passion for knowledge, and his ambition for high achievement. His mother and father were an unfailing source of affection and encouragement; indeed, their parental pride and expectations undoubtedly spurred Woodrow’s aspirations.

The Rev. Wilson’s relationship with his son was especially close and sympathetic. Friend, counselor, and critic, he kept before young Woodrow
the highest standards of moral and intellectual excellence. Despite Wilson's austere exterior (he knew himself to be cold and reserved), he had great need of love and affection. His letters often dilate on the joys of friendship. Wilson felt himself awkward and inept in "society," particularly in the company of young ladies. The only "love letters" in this volume are those to his first cousin, "Hattie" Woodrow, who was to reject his proposal of marriage. Although these pages reveal an intense, sometimes troubled, young man, one finds little to sustain the Freud-Bullitt psychological interpretation of Wilson. Indeed the documents presented here refute many of the particulars upon which that interpretation was based.

What emerges most remarkably in this volume is the clarity and determination with which the young Wilson envisioned and pursued his purpose in life: to become a statesman. An absorption (almost an obsession) with statesmanship dominated his thought; consciously he prepared himself for his life's work. Through the close study of political leaders of his time and former ages he sought to identify the essential qualities of the statesman. In an essay on "The Ideal Statesman," Wilson delineated the perfect model which he strove to approximate. The ideal statesman must have a highly cultivated mind and profound learning; he must have insight into human nature and sympathy with the strivings of the people; he must work unceasingly and trust in God; he must place principle above party and self-interest; and perhaps most important of all, he must be something of a prophet with "brilliant, though partial, intimations of future events." This was to be the discipline of the future president.

For Wilson, politics was "a war of causes: a joust of principles." The essence of representative government was, for him, public debate in which truth prevailed through the clash of opposing arguments. Debate also served the essential function of educating public opinion. Oratorical skill was therefore the first weapon in the arsenal of the statesman. In his quest for the power of eloquence, Wilson devoted himself to the study of the great orators from Demosthenes to Bright. His successes in collegiate debate attested to his growing effectiveness as a public speaker.

Wilson saw his mission and that of other "upright and intelligent men" to be one of "purifying the politics of our country." Like Henry Adams, he was repelled by the degradation of American democracy, by the political jobbery and corruption, by the decline of statesmanship. Universal suffrage, he thought, was "the foundation of every evil in this country." In 1876, he confided to his diary: "The American Republic will in my opinion never celebrate another Centennial. At least under its present Constitution and laws." Underlying his disillusionment was Wilson's realization that in the present state of public affairs there was no place for the statesman. He thus set himself the ambitious task of reforming the American political system.

The root of the evil Wilson found in the Constitutional provision for the separation of the executive and legislative branches. This had resulted in the subordination of the other branches to the Congress and to the "galling tyranny" of government by Congressional committee. Instead of open de-
bate of issues by party leaders, decisions were made behind closed doors by an irresponsible handful of men. Wilson, however, took hope in the Anglo-Saxon genius for self-government. A strong admirer of the English Constitution, he prescribed a remodeling of American institutions along the lines of cabinet government. The President would select his Cabinet ministers from the Congress; these would defend their policies in legislative debate and resign as a body if defeated. This, Wilson thought, would bring about a renaissance of statesmanship. In his essay, "Cabinet Government in the United States," published in the International Review of August, 1879, twenty-two-year-old Woodrow Wilson presented this sophisticated critique of American politics which he was to develop more fully in later writings. Reading these documents of the young Wilson, one is struck by the degree to which he had already articulated a political philosophy which was to find its most dramatic expression in his Presidency.

University of Minnesota

RUDOLPH J. VECOLI


When Fred A. Shannon died in 1963, he left a nearly completed manuscript of The Centennial Years, which he had written in 1955 and 1956. Despite his great investment of time and effort, Shannon abandoned the project for the more congenial task of an agricultural history of the United States. On behalf of Shannon's students, Robert Huhn Jones, a Shannon Ph.D. who helped research The Centennial Years, located and edited the manuscript for publication. The proceeds from this volume will establish a graduate scholarship in American History at the University of Illinois.

Spanning the period between Philadelphia's Centennial Exposition of 1876 and Chicago's Columbian Exposition of 1893, The Centennial Years has many virtues. Forthright in his prejudices and clearcut in his opinions, Shannon is never devious. His heroes are the little guys, society's underdogs and their leaders; while his devils are the monopolists, the exploiters who lived by the sweat of other men's brows, their minions and their apologists. Shannon has warmhearted, generous sympathy for Southern sharecroppers and tenant farmers whether black or white, midwestern wheat and corn farmers and skilled and unskilled wage earners. On the other hand, landlords and moneylenders from country storekeepers to bankers, middlemen and employers, from sweatshop proprietors to corporation presidents, arouse Shannon's ire. Railroad managers are doubly damned—not only did they charge farmers exorbitant freight rates, they reduced laborers to a subsistence level.

But the hottest room in Shannon's hell is reserved for the labor-spying, strikebreaking, violence-provoking Pinkerton Detective Agency. Shannon likes Representative William R. Morrison of Illinois for fighting to revise the tariff downward, William Godwin Moody for attacking land monopolies,
Milton George and Charles W. Macune for organizing Farmers' Alliances, and Joseph R. Buchanan and Martin Irons for energetically leading strikes. On the other hand, he dislikes Representative Samuel J. Randall of Pennsylvania for championing protection, railroad presidents Franklin B. Gowen, Charles E. Perkins and Jay Gould for attempting to destroy unions, John D. Rockefeller for monopolizing the oil industry, Allen Nevins for sympathetically interpreting Rockefeller's career, and Terence V. Powderly, head of the Knights of Labor, for being "vague, uncertain, and vacillating," for opposing strikes and for failing as a negotiator.

There is more to Shannon's work than mere forthrightness. His general conclusions, though conventional, are amply proved. The centennial years "provided a very substantial cornerstone for twentieth-century American industry to build on," and today's government controls, strong labor unions and vigorous social justice movements had their beginnings in those years. More specifically, Shannon's chapters on the tariff, inflation and the farmer, distilling years of research, are both authoritative and lucid.

The book, however, has its deficiencies. It is one sided and dated. Shannon knows what he want and finds what he is looking for. He espouses Matthew Josephson's robber baron hypothesis wholeheartedly and prefers Ida Tarbell's hostile account of Rockefeller to the "benign view" of Allen Nevins. He dismisses the considerable body of evidence amassed by those who have denied the robber baron thesis by exclaiming, "Fads in the writing of history have come and gone, and there is no particular reason to believe that this one about the complete benevolence of all nineteenth-century masters of capital will survive for long." Also, Shannon's warm sympathies for labor lead him to make James McParlan, whom he describes as "a hired Pinkerton thug," an agent provocateur responsible for Molly Maguire murders. "By 1875," two years after McParlan infiltrated the Mollies, "hell was popping in the coal fields." Shannon's account lacks the balanced judgment of the recent study by Wayne G. Broehl, Jr. In short, many of Shannon's views are more congenial to the 1930s than to the 1960s, and even though the editor has added some recent titles to the bibliography (including Broehl's book) the text is virtually innocent of anything published after 1965. Furthermore, the political chapters—to a large extent analyzing platforms, elections and major legislation—are not as authoritative or stimulating as Shannon's treatment of economic subjects.

Nevertheless The Centennial Years is useful, and Robert Huhn Jones has done his task well. Working from as many as four drafts of some chapters and just a rough draft of others, he has left few indications that the manuscript was unfinished. Jones has worked unobtrusively, and we are indebted to him for this work of an outstanding historian.
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