
The purpose of this study is to follow the development of the religious community, Herrnhut in Germany, and the same type of community, Bethlehem in the United States, from their beginnings through the changes of history. This means that the author must keep moving between old Germany and new America at a time when travel between the two continents was not as quick as today and communications were not facilitated by telephone, telegraph, and air mail.

The first part dealing with Moravian beliefs and practices gives the key to an understanding of the entire religious movement. Considering the importance of this part it seems rather scant with its thirteen and a third pages. It strikes this reviewer as the weakest of the four parts of the study, also as the one for which the author has least sympathy and understanding, for her approach to the subject throughout is too rational, yet the subject is highly irrational. The author seems to forget St. Paul’s admonition to the Corinthians that the natural man “receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned” (I Cor. 2:14). This lack of empathy is not surprising in a book selected by a committee of the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University to receive the annual Bancroft Award established by the Trustees of that University, but in justice to the Moravians, who, according to the spiritual insights of their day, sought first the Kingdom of Heaven, it deserves to be noted.

In part two the author presents two chapters discussing the “Emergence of Communal Government” and “The Use of the Lot.” In the second chapter the author’s rationalistic and analytical approach to a matter which can be honestly and fairly judged only in its spiritual context of faith, does seem to go too far in imputing impure motives when we read:

Thus the historical fact that the lot with rare exception tended to coincide with the viewpoint adopted by the Count [Zinzendorf] or his aristocratic lieutenants should be interpreted not so much as an indication of the Count’s favor in God’s eyes, or of a simple reflection of the operation of a game of chance, but rather as evidence of human manipulation of divine will. It should not be overlooked that after Christ’s election as Chief Elder the Lord in effect was generally granted no say in the matter of whether or not He should be consulted on a given issue.

This not isolated rationalistic conclusion of an analytical writer about a
Highly esoteric and spiritual matter shows to what degree modern religious skepticism has influenced judgment.

Part three discusses the development of the choir system, the modification and decline of the choirs, and marital norms and behavior. These three chapters, of course, are closely related to each other because they deal with problems of housing, employing and keeping married people and progeny, and single persons, happy and out of trouble in the same community. On the American frontier the development of the choir system, especially for single men, answered the pressing problem of furnishing housing efficiently and effectively at the lowest cost possible because the place of work of the occupants was situated under the same roof. The following account of a visit to Bethlehem in 1754 illustrates this:

It is similar to a castle; is built of sandstone, has five stories and contains over 70 large and small rooms. In the basement there are several carpenters' shops. On the first and second floors there are two dining halls, five tables in each, at which twenty people can be seated per table. The whole of the third floor is taken up by sleeping quarters with its 200 beds. On the fourth floor is the silk-worm industry, and on the fifth hang the clothes of the Brethren. The roof is flat, in the Italian style, so that one could actually walk on it.

Considering the author's observations on marital norms and behavior, the disinclination of well-placed single men to accept the burden of marriage is not in the least surprising. Even though the author quotes Zinzendorf's religious goals of matrimony, such an appeal within its rigidly regulated setting would scarcely have been more effective than St. Paul's observations that it is better not to marry. In this part of the study more statistics of persons who left the Moravian community and lived a married life outside as an individual in the American economy, would have been illuminating.

The fourth part of this study deals with the history of the economic institutions of Herrnhut and Bethlehem. It is the strongest part of the book and leaves the impression that this subject interested the author most. The first chapter points out the differences in property ownership in Herrnhut, where social distinctions and property ownership were more in keeping with its aristocratic leadership, and the actual communal ownership of property at Bethlehem. Here, as elsewhere, the pragmatic approach to problems of life on the frontier are noticed as opposed to the theoretical approach in more rigidly organized and more culturally mature Herrnhut. The advantages of communal ownership and operation in an undeveloped new land became quite obvious in Bethlehem, as it did later to the Harmonists in Western Pennsylvania. This part also deals with the processes of economic diversification in the two communities.

The author here deals most interestingly with the business manager of Herrnhut, Abraham Dürninger, who represented in himself the ideal of a Christian businessman. He was strikingly similar to Godfrey Haga of Philadelphia, who operated with Frederick Rapp, leader of the Harmonists, on the same principles. In 1753 Dürninger was already shipping
Herrnhut linen to places as distant as New York, Jamaica, and Buenos Aires. Expansion of their economy along similar lines was forbidden the Moravians in Bethlehem by British law; the Moravians did not engage in manufacturing pursuits on any large scale. In place of such development the Bethlehem Moravians became active in commerce, and by virtue of the services they performed for the public they became an important factor in the American commercial world. The inevitable contacts with more worldly outsiders which such economic relations with non-Moravians brought, not only resulted in "Economic Diversification" but also in the financial growth described by the author in the tenth chapter of the book.

In the last chapter the author discusses "The Communal Economy on Trial" ending with the words:

The primacy given to the religious and social goals of the community effectively thwarted any secularization of the German settlement. But in Bethlehem prosperity attained under a communal economy merely accentuated the desire for personal autonomy in economic affairs. Private businesses were soon flourishing, while the communal economy was going into debt. Imperceptibly the Moravians in Bethlehem had come to separate their economic and social roles from their religious role. By the mid-nineteenth century Bethlehem was a prospering American city, many of whose citizens happened to subscribe to the Moravian religion, whereas Herrnhut was still a Moravian community, whose religious character continued to be reflected in its social and economic organization. Its economy was as different from the rest of the Oberlausitz as it was from the economic system of its sister community of Bethlehem, whose organization had once so closely mirrored its own.

The four parts of the book are surveyed in a conclusion of some ten pages in which Herrnhut's and Bethlehem's histories are compared and the "moral" of this comparison stated. To this reader it would seem that the study substantiates what similar comparisons have repeatedly established, viz. that spiritual and cultural values live longer and deeper in the Old World than in pragmatic America. As the poet Lenau, who observed these matters firsthand, put it:

Hier sind tückische Lüfte, schlechrender Tod. In dem grossen Nebellande Amerika's werden der Liebe leise die Adern geöffnet, und sie verblutet sich unbemerkt.

Moravians in Two Worlds is well documented, has a good and informative selected bibliography, and a carefully worked out index. The frequent references to the original dissertation of the author from which this book is an abstract, would make it seem that serious students of this subject would do best to get a copy of the fuller dissertation. The publisher apparently found the superior dissertation too expensive to print for today's market.

Clark University

Karl J. R. Arndt
BOOK REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTES


This book is an outgrowth of Mr. Murtagh's former associations with the history and architecture of Bethlehem, Pa. He served as the first executive director of the Annie S. Kemmerer Museum and executive secretary of Historic Bethlehem, Incorporated. He has recently been appointed first Keeper of the National Register in the newly created Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, National Park Service.

The author has clearly succeeded in his stated objective—to shed light on Moravian achievements in architecture and community planning, particularly at Bethlehem, because he considers the Bethlehem structures the "purest expression of Moravian thought... to have been erected in this country as well as the largest group of such buildings." The book reflects this emphasis on Bethlehem, but it is balanced with brief descriptions of other Moravian settlements in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and North Carolina, which reinforce the author's main points regarding the distinctive qualities of Moravian planning and architecture. The book is well organized, informatively documented and handsomely produced.

Mr. Murtagh opens with a general historical account of the origins and development of the Moravian Church in Europe and the New World. This account spans considerable time and space. The inclusion of a simple map would have clarified the geographical setting, the "dispersion" of the Protestants (following the Thirty Years' War), and the Moravian missionary movements. The missionary zeal was a particularly strong aspect of their religion, and one which produced wide-ranging attempts at settlement, including the Virgin Islands, Greenland, Georgia, and Pennsylvania during the 1730s and 1740s.

Another background chapter explains that these settlements were a "unified effort pre-planned by Moravian leaders," hence the extraordinary documentation that exists for Moravian missionary communities. Murtagh discusses the three planned European Moravian towns of Herrnhut (1722), Nisky (1742), and Klein Welke (1756), all grouped approximately fifty miles east of Dresden. These were basically gridiron plans with a dominant main thoroughfare, and a central square surrounded by the church and related buildings, with peripheral industrial and craft buildings, and the ever present burial plot set aside as "God's Acre." In this chapter, Murtagh illustrates the American Moravian parallels to these European precedents, including Bethlehem, Lititz, Emmaus, Lebanon, and Nazareth, Pennsylvania, and Salem, North Carolina. The planning similarities are obvious, and the evidence is presented very effectively, using illustrations of manuscript plans reproduced from the various Archives of the Moravian Church.

The main body of the book is devoted to the buildings at Bethlehem, arranged chronologically beginning with the first log house (1741), and ending with the Girl's Boarding School (1790). About twenty buildings are discussed with emphasis on their design, use, and relation to the community.
plan. This section is amply documented and illustrated with superb manuscript drawings and old views. The author does not include any nineteenth-century buildings (like the impressive 1806 Central Moravian Church) because these “non-Germanic” buildings mark the complete dissipation of “strength of the Germanic building tradition.” Such limitations are practical, but they tend to limit our view of the continued community growth. A map might have shown the fulfillment (or dissolution) of the planning, and also would have served to show the location of those eighteenth-century buildings that have survived.

For a book that emphasizes architectural uniqueness, there is a distressing absence of illustrations that would prove the author’s thesis of such uniqueness. The exterior disposition of architectural features is amply described, as are the room arrangements; but there is not a single interior photograph, nor any views of details, although the author alludes to the Germanic flavor of the herringbone patterned wood doors, palm latches, red tile floors, cockhead hinges, tile stoves and graceful balustraded stairways, to mention a few.

Mr. Murtagh gives much space to the surviving second Single Brother’s House (1748) which is described as one of the “most ambitious” and “most historic” buildings in Bethlehem. Yet it is not illustrated except as part of the scene in a 1754 engraved view of Bethlehem. Despite the “heavy remodeling,” recent photographs (with adequate explanation) would at least give the reader a sense of scale and show the “very interesting vestiges of its eighteenth-century origin.”

Mr. Murtagh refers to grouped buildings that “interact as a cohesive whole, creating a successful urban complex of considerable beauty and standing as a prime example of the eighteenth century’s capabilities in the planning and control of a community’s environment,” but there are no photographs which would enable the reader to grasp these interactions and spatial relationships which the planner’s jargon suggests.

There is an excellent bibliography and ample reference to published source material in the footnotes. Unquestionably this book makes a solid contribution to the literature on Moravian building and planning in America, and makes available the magnificent drawings that record the skill and faith of the largely anonymous Moravian master planners and builders.

National Park Service

LEE H. NELSON


Unfortunately this work is not a collection of unpublished Wilson material, of which much exists, after the fashion of Julian Boyd’s Jefferson Papers, but a reissue of the three volumes published in 1804 by Bird Wilson, the statesman’s son. Principally devoted to his law lectures inaugurated in 1790, while the national capital was in Philadelphia, before an audience including President Washington and other dignitaries as well as many fashionable ladies, the volumes do include nine other miscellaneous papers. Most im-
portant among these are Wilson's pre-Revolutionary comments on the power of Parliament, his appeal on behalf of the Bank of North America, and his address of November 26, 1787 before the Pennsylvania convention to ratify the United States Constitution. Readers fortunate enough to possess the Bird Wilson edition and McMaster and Stone's *Pennsylvania and the Federal Constitution*, or even the *Selected Political Essays of James Wilson* edited in 1930 by Randolph G. Adams, will feel no irresistible impulse driving them to the bookstore in order to acquire the John Harvard Library's new edition.

Nevertheless Professor McCloskey of Harvard College and the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History have done a good service in publishing the new edition. For one thing, the Bird Wilson edition is out of print and not easily obtainable. Furthermore, Professor McCloskey has corrected errata and obvious misprints, added some footnotes, amplified the table of contents, compiled an eight-page glossary identifying the works cited by Wilson, and contributed an excellent introduction of fifty pages. And lastly, any scholarly publication which serves to direct public attention towards the accomplishments of James Wilson is to be welcomed. For somehow Wilson has become the forgotten man among the heroic figures of the Founding Fathers. As Professor McCloskey says:

posterity's neglect of Wilson is nothing short of astonishing when it is measured against his claims to be remembered. . . . He was one of six men who signed both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and his contribution to the deliberations of the Federal Convention was second only to Madison's. He was the principal figure in the struggle to secure ratification of the Constitution in Pennsylvania, the approval of that state being indispensable to the success of the whole constitutional movement. The important Pennsylvania State constitution of 1790 was very largely his work. He was one of the original justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and was commonly accepted in a nation already much dominated by lawyers as the most learned and profound legal scholar of his generation.

To account for this paradoxical oblivion the editor mentions several factors. Wilson was in many ways too far in advance of his time. His financial speculations and quest for wealth (he died in North Carolina, a fugitive from imprisonment for debt) and his associations with affluent and ambitious businessmen were detrimental to his reputation. The public could not believe (although it was a fact) that he was a genuine devotee of both democracy and nationalism (in contrast to the one-sided philosophies of Jefferson and Hamilton). Thus Wilson fell into oblivion, even though history has demonstrated that he "was more nearly right about America than they were. . . . Just as Wilson contended, popular government and the rule of law have been more complementary than antithetical in the American historical experience." Even though "America came to practice what he preached," it has not yet quite managed to catch up with his prescient precepts. When Wilson sat on the Supreme Court the time was not ripe for the dour Scot to win the acclaim which later came to the
affable Virginian, John Marshall. When the nation came to accept Wilson's tenets it preferred to hear them stated in the memorable phrases of Marshall, Webster, and Lincoln, rather than in Wilson's ungainly and diffuse prose. Perhaps Professor McCloskey's presentation of Wilson's work and thought will increase the nation's respect for his solid contributions to its enduring greatness.

Edward Dumbauld


This comprehensive and well-edited volume, part of the well-known _American Heritage Series_ of primary source materials in various aspects of the history of the United States, presents a judicious sampling of documents which illustrate the role of government in aiding and stimulating American economic development during the ante bellum period. Those familiar with the studies of such historians as Louis Hartz, Oscar and Mary Handlin, Nathan Miller, James N. Primm, and Milton S. Heath, in addition to Carter Goodrich himself, will not be surprised to find assembled here fresh evidence that this role was extensive indeed, as a mere listing of Goodrich's subject headings well indicates: _The Promotion of Transport, The Encouragement of Western Settlement, The Encouragement of Manufactures, The Protection of Commerce, The Provision of Money and Credit, The Facilitation of Corporate Enterprise, The Development of Human Capacities, and The Utilization of the Working Force._ In short, there was no major component of economic growth during this period in which the fostering hand of government at one level or another was not apparent.

Yet if it is possible to err in underestimating the economic function of government during this era, it is also possible to overestimate it, and it is part of the merit of this volume that it steers a middle course between these equally fallacious alternatives. As Goodrich points out in summing up a thoughtful introduction, it has been "the deep-seated preference of the American people to employ the powers of government to influence the economy at strategic points needing special attention rather than to attempt its operation in detail," and the documents here presented bear out the highly pragmatic and selective nature of the way in which public authority became involved in American enterprise in the pre-Civil War years. As is obvious to any student of the period, there was heavy involvement, especially at the state level, in the promotion of transport; but as Goodrich indicates, the emphasis was clearly upon facilitating economic development rather than upon deriving actual revenue from the roads, canals, and railways which received one form or another of governmental assistance. Similarly, the vast public domain was parceled out in such a way as to promote a maximum of settlement rather than to constitute a "great fiscal resource" of the federal treasury.

In regard to manufacturing, commerce, and the development of business:
corporations, the role of government was clearly ancillary rather than boldly innovative, despite modest programs of state aid to industry in a few places like New York, and an occasional spectacular example of federal solicitude for the promotion of trade such as the Perry expedition to Japan. By modern standards little was done to regulate conditions of labor save in the laying down of provisions for the supervision of slavery in the southern states, and as Goodrich observes, "even less governmental action with respect to the great additions to the working force that came from abroad," although Wisconsin did temporarily maintain an unusual and highly interesting agency to attract persons from Europe to settle within its boundaries. In the field of money and credit there was considerably more controversial activity, running "the gamut from bold innovation to an almost complete disclaimer of responsibility," but even here there was "no concerted effort toward 'developmental' banking or the channeling of investment through governmental agencies into private industry." In general, there was an overall tendency for governments to withdraw from various areas of activity when it became apparent that private enterprise could handle the situation by itself.

With Goodrich's selection of documents there is little with which to quibble except that few illustrate the action of local governments, as opposed to national and state ones, in becoming involved in economic enterprise. In the main, however, there is a satisfying blend of familiar sources, such as Hamilton's Report on Manufactures and Jackson's Veto of the bill to recharter the Second Bank of the United States, and some unusual ones like the Georgia Lottery Act of 1803, or James K. Polk's message to the Tennessee Legislature in 1847 on the subject of bank frauds. In sum, this book should serve well as a source of supplementary reading material in courses on American economic history, and provide food for thought for general readers who are interested in studying the role of government in enterprise—surely a pertinent subject in a world increasingly affected by and concerned with the problems of nations whose economic capacities are under-developed, as ours once were.

State University of New York at Buffalo

W. David Lewis


Under the sponsorship of the Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation a conference of historians gathered for the purpose of discussing a scholarly topic. Their pedagogical joust centered on a relatively neglected theme in American economic history brought to attention by the current interest in urban history and by doubts cast by certain scholars on a thesis presented in Robert G. Albion's The Rise of the New York Port which was published in 1939. Albion emphasized the importance of maritime trade in the rise of New York City to predominance. Specifically, the conference considered
the economic factors which influenced the growth of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore in the early national era.

This volume contains the proceedings of the meeting—the papers read, the comments of discussants, and the record of open debate—along with a concisely tailored introduction prepared by David T. Gilchrist of the staff of the host foundation. Generally, the text is tightly textured and reveals that the papers were designed for oral presentation while the discussion sections, as one would expect, lose the spirit of spontaneity and intimate challenge when reduced to the printed page.

The total effect underlines the fact that history is more complex and disorderly than most people imagine and that "there are as many kinds of history as there are historians, and each historian writes his own kind of history." As one discussant put it in the summary session, "If a conference is successful only if it raises more questions than it answers, then this conference has been exceedingly successful." In the face of the many questions and points of emphasis, what seemed to be fact had a tendency to fade away like the Cheshire cat.

None of this is meant to belittle the conference but rather to emphasize the difficult nature of its problems. Those who presented papers or prepared comments included: Julius Rubin and Carter Goodrich of the University of Pittsburgh; Everett S. Lee, at the time Professor of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, and Dorothy S. Brady of the same institution; George Rogers Taylor, Senior Resident Scholar of the Foundation; Gordon C. Bjork and Joseph Dorfman of Columbia University; Rhoda M. Dorsey of Goucher College; Robert A. Davison of Hofstra University; John G. H. Hutchins of Cornell University; Herman E. Kroos, economist of New York University Graduate School of Business Administration; Stuart Bruchey of Michigan State University; and Murray N. Rothbard of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

The keynote address, "Urban Growth and Regional Development," was delivered by Professor Rubin. In his thoughtful statement he emphasized the similarities between cities and their hinterlands and advanced the idea that it might be more productive for a study of American economic growth to minimize the old urban-rural conflict thesis for one of mutual influence. He found not only constant interaction between the two but also a cultural homogeneity, that is not common to most cultures, especially in the northern part of the United States.

The main topic of the conference was presented under four headings: "Population," "Foreign Trade and Manufacturing," "Financial Institutions," and "Economic Thought." All were based on a prepared set of population statistics of the four seaport cities as viewed from their areas of specialization. Since growth is relative and since many of the conferees were concerned with qualitative values rather than measurement, the fundamental point as to whether or not there was growth concerned the group throughout the meeting.

This disagreement on growth was clearly seen in the papers of Professor Lee and Dr. Taylor. Mr. Lee found no spectacular growth in any of the
four cities comparable to the urban development of the nineteenth century. Only New York City seemed to have had any noticeable development, a fact attributed to the influx of immigrants from abroad. Dr. Taylor took issue with this conclusion as his research revealed "the rate of growth of these cities in the pre-railroad age as being significantly rapid."

Another problem was that of placing the varied approaches of the speakers in proper perspective and in integrating the material addressed to such varied questions as hinterland relationships, the influence of foreign trade, of manufacturing or financial institutions, and the application of systematic economic thought to public policy. Matters like money, capital market, foreign trade, and manufacturing were generally relegated to subordinate places of importance. The influence of economic thinkers on change seemed to be less important than the pragmatic decisions of the market place, and their influence is difficult to measure. No agreement was reached on the relative importance of manufacturing and trade on growth. There was, as Carter Goodrich stated in his summary of the conference, a feeling that the four cities "were not making an enormous success story."

University of Chattanooga

JAMES W. LIVINGOOD


In a distinguished career of teaching and writing that now extends over nearly half a century, Professor Nichols has been preoccupied almost continually with studying the evolution and operation of American political institutions. Although his most significant books have dealt with the decade preceding the Civil War, his probing investigations have taken him backwards in time to Anglo-Saxon England in an effort to explain American politics. The present volume, then, represents the fruits of a scholarly lifetime of reflection devoted to a central aspect of American culture.

In an earlier work, Blueprint for Leviathan (1963), Professor Nichols traced the process by which American inventiveness produced formal constitutional documents, or designs for government. In what may be regarded as a companion volume, he has now focused on politics, on the arrangements that men made to contest for power within the government. It is, as he makes clear, a study of political improvisation.

Starting with a brief but essential summary of the English background, Professor Nichols moves quickly into the Colonial experience, stressing the wide diversity of institutions and practices and explaining why English forms were soon cast aside or altered almost beyond recognition by local improvisations. The narrative proceeds through the Revolutionary era, which created new tests for the ingenuity of American leaders, to the formation of the Federal Constitution and the creation, at least potentially, of a national political arena. Throughout this long period, politics remained localized, unstructured, and even highly personal.

The first party system, which began to form late in Washington's administration was, in the author's opinion, barely entitled to that designa-
tion, for it never reached institutional maturity and quickly succumbed to factionalism. The reasons are to be found in the reluctance of the Jeffersonians to endow the central government with more than a modicum of power. Consequently, meaningful contests were confined to the state and local levels. The emergence of the second party system, which owed as little to planning or premeditation as did the first, was a slow process that did not achieve acceptance or stability until 1844, or even 1848.

The end product of centuries of improvisation, resulting neither from ideological conviction nor explicit constitutional design, the American two-party system assumed institutional form in the 1840s. Thereafter, innovations were to be relatively minor and technical in nature. The parties, as Professor Nichols sees them, were "designed to emphasize agreement on the nature of the republic and to supply candidates for the recurrent contests who entertained similar views and to ensure issues so narrowly defined that the battles, though exciting, would never be dangerous." Only in 1860 did this design prove faulty.

Because Professor Nichols has not produced simple explanations, or set forth neatly structured hypotheses, his findings may well appear to be confusing to some and disappointing to others. But those who share his understanding that in each region, each state, and even in each locality—especially down to the early nineteenth century—modes of conducting politics were shaped by complex environmental differences will have no difficulty in appreciating his accomplishment. Similarly, those who see politics only as reflecting the operation of objective, impersonal factors will doubtless be put off by his view of American politics as involving relationships among personalities, whose reactions to one another, as well as to groups within the society, shaped the course of party development.

Representing as it does the first attempt to synthesize the findings of recent scholarship to produce a comprehensive narrative of American political development down to the point where institutionalized parties dominated the scene, this perceptive and detailed study is a major scholarly achievement. Having done more than any other scholar to reinvigorate the study of the history of American politics, he has placed further in his debt the "rising generation of political historians" to whom, with customary grace and generosity, he dedicated this worthy volume.

Rutgers—The State University

Richard P. McCormick


Some will remember the Broadway musical, "Pins and Needles." In it a girl interviewed for a department store job had a song with the line, "What there was to know about me. Macy's knew." This may be applied to Professor Young's diligent researches into the birth, rearing, occupations, and connections of men down to the third or fourth degree of prominence in the period he treats. He has gone to the sources in great variety in
manner that provokes admiration. His style of writing is spirited, to match his zeal in exploring evidence.

The book answers, in much detail, four questions: Who were the Democratic Republicans? What were the issues that brought the movement into being? What was it like as an organized entity? What was its philosophy? The author's exposition surrounds conspicuous leaders, such as George Clinton, Chancellor Livingston, Hamilton, Schuyler, and Jay, with their political supporters and antagonists who figure only as "extras" or "walk-ons" in the briefer presentations. Here we have a close-up, with all sorts of participants identified and quoted—personal and newspaper correspondents, electioneering orators, witnesses of public demonstrations, and a narrative of major and minor events that called forth party antagonisms. In a word, here is the texture of New York politics, and to no small degree of national politics, in the formative generation.

A good deal of work went into the analyses of voters and votes that appear in brief statements in the text and in appendix tables. Thus the volume serves both readers who look for a running account, and the increasing number of those wishing a breakdown of electors by occupations, property holdings, and places of residence.

It is a book of the warp and woof of politicking, and one that expects the reader to have his own opinions of the relative merits of conflicting principles involved. It adds a dimension to the excellence of leaders who must participate in the scrimmage without losing sight of their goals. Their constancy is the more emphatic as we observe friends and foes who changed sides in the course of the contests. Not that the captains—say Clinton and Hamilton—were unwilling to make concessions in order to save their major aims; their occasional yielding showed their fitness to command.

As we witness the rough-and-tumble, we wonder how wise measures emerged. Aristocrats, early divided in their own ranks, managed to preserve influence in an expanding democracy. Politics in New York were healthily furious as compared to Virginia, and by the same token kept better to the line of national progress. It was Virginia that frequently raised dogmatic constitutional objections. One hazards that the difference was in the contrasting economies and populations of the two states. One was varied, with a great port, a middle class of yeomen and mechanics, and an inpouring of immigrants; the other, typically devoted to planting, with slave labor, lingered in control of a privileged few. While Professor Young's study is of the practice of politics, the economic background of controversies is always evident.

It is said that mongrels have more stamina, though not the style, of the purebred. True or not of animals, New York politics had the vitality to survive the talents of Aaron Burr, the like of whom was not found elsewhere. Richard Henry Lee, Patrick Henry and some more were this or that, but you knew where to place them. Burr was something else again—elegant and coarse, trusted and untrustworthy, eligible and perverse. He appears often in these pages, treated as he was seen by his contemporaries of differing judgments.
Readers will be informed by Professor Young’s portrayal of George Clinton. He is more sympathetically drawn than by some, or is it that his mistakes excite our compassion and take off from his stubbornness? Once, during the Revolution, he nursed Hamilton through a fever, and the two were friends. Later, when at opposite poles, Clinton’s political skill was matched against Hamilton’s ineptitude in party management but superiority in espousing national rather than state authority. To this reviewer, Chancellor Livingston does not come off well. A comparison with a certain southern aristocrat of wealth, learning, and graces keeps coming to mind. This gentleman, after holding distinguished appointive offices, concluded to run in a popular election. His speech at a rally was good enough, but what enthused his constituents were the kegs of beer on the platform, tapped immediately the harangue was over. As the voters filled their mugs with suds, the candidate turned his back and regaled himself from a silver flask of whiskey. Somehow, he didn’t have the common touch.

Readers will await the author’s next volume, which will “carry the Republicans through the testing in the administration of John Adams . . . and beyond.”

New York City


The publication of Noble Cunningham’s two volumes on the Jeffersonian Republicans turned the study of American political parties, which had previously concentrated on personalities, ideologies, or economic interests, to questions of party organization and electoral techniques. The unarticulated premise of recent party studies is that effective organization and electioneering methods were the real determinants of party success; that the Republican party was better organized and more effective in its appeals to the electorate and, therefore, was able to dominate national politics until its disintegration in the 1820s. These studies further argue that effective state and local organizations were the foundation of the national party. Carl Prince’s New Jersey’s Jeffersonian Republicans is a study of one such effective state organization which he offers “as one more link in the growing chain of state studies of our first political parties.”

Prince contends that a loosely organized anti-Federal faction, responding to stimuli provided by national political developments (particularly the passage and enforcement of the Alien and Sedition Acts) “coalesced into an institutionalized party” and gained control of the state in 1800. Thereafter, Republican domination was threatened only during the short-lived, nationwide, Federalist resurgence in 1812.

During its years of ascendency the Republican party in New Jersey relied on strong county organizations, widely circulated newspapers, and ironclad control of state and federal patronage to maintain internal discipline and assure party regularity. While it remained a decentralized organization which permitted local variation of party machinery, the state
nominating convention and legislative caucus provided centralized direction and control.

The legislative caucus dispensed patronage "with scarcely faltering unity," provided solid party majorities on sensitive issues before the state legislature, and "drew the line completely" between the two parties. The state nominating convention was a singular and original contribution of New Jersey Republicans to the mechanics of party management. It provided a "clearinghouse for Republican disagreements over ticketmaking," and settled "nomination conflicts that might otherwise have riven the party" thereby keeping internecine party differences, which might have destroyed the party's public image, out of the public eye. The decisions of the convention gave the impression that "everything had been accomplished openly and freely in the best tradition of the democratic process."

Despite this impression, Prince argues that the Jeffersonian Republican party in New Jersey was not a democratic organization responding and open to the yeoman farmers it purported to represent. It was a party of officeholders and "party activists" who turned political victory into "money, prestige and power" for a "favored few," consisting of established families, party printers and Republican officeholders. The New Jersey Democracy was, in fact, "a remarkably closed and ordered hierarchy" in which "the grass roots participation . . . was response to a smoothly functioning leadership."

Unchallenged by a viable opposition after the demise of the Federalists in 1815, the state organization divided into a number of personal and sectional factions reflecting and contributing to similar developments in the national organization which finally collapsed in 1824.

Mr. Prince sketches the details of party organization and operation in meticulous (indeed, excruciating) detail for which students of American political parties should be grateful. Yet somehow the book left this reviewer unsatisfied. If careful organization and effective electioneering were the causes of the party's success, why was it unable to deliver the state's electoral vote in the only seriously contested elections in 1800 and 1812? Is it possible that Republican success can be attributed to something other than effective organization? If party regularity was so highly valued, how does one account for the irregularity of the state's delegation to the twelfth Congress? (Of eleven "party issues" analyzed by Reginald Horseman, the New Jersey delegation supported the administration unanimously only once. Three-three and four-two divisions were the most common.)

The study gives no indication of who the New Jersey Republicans were, from where they drew their support and on which issues they appealed to the people. Furthermore, if the state organization was an integral part of a national organization, relations between the two ought to have been more thoroughly explored.

In short, while Prince's book cannot be faulted as an analysis of a party organization, it provides only a partial explanation of the party's success at both the state and national level.


drawson State College

Victor Sapio

Aside from a delightful chapter in U. B. Phillips's classic American Negro Slavery and the usual spate of local and statewide studies, historians generally have accorded scant attention to the history of Negro slavery in the North and even less to the northern abolition of that institution. The publication of Arthur Zilversmit's brief but perceptive account of The First Emancipation is, therefore, a welcomed contribution.

Pointing out that although the slave population of the North was relatively small during the pre-revolutionary era, Zilversmit explains that in most northern areas, including New England, Negro slavery was as common and as acceptable as it was in the South. Treatment of slaves, of course, varied from master to master, but in general the lives of even northern Negro slaves were undeniably harsh. Mutilation, torture, and even such perverse punishments as castration and burning at the stake were not uncommon.

After giving the reader a general introduction and overview of the problem of Negro slavery in the North, the author proceeds to chronicle the efforts made from the late seventeenth century to the early nineteenth, by both individuals and groups, to abolish slavery in the northern states.

Although many individuals of varying religious and secular persuasions denounced the institution of slavery in the North, the Society of Friends was the only group to collectively advocate abolition during the pre-revolutionary period. The Quakers—at least after the conversion or expulsion of recalcitrant slave-owning members—believed that slavery was inconsistent and incompatible with the teachings of Jesus. Nor were the Quakers content merely to put their own house in order. Antislavery leaders within the Society of Friends realized that convincing fellow Quakers was not enough and that universal abolition must be made the order of the day. Accordingly, Quaker propagandists and activists such as Anthony Benezet set out to convince non-Quakers as to the advisability and morality of abolishing the heinous institution of slavery.

In addition to and perhaps more important than this Quaker activism, antislavery and pro-abolitionist sentiment increased measurably in the North as a result of the ideological implications of the American Revolution. The intellectual ferment of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment and the libertarian principles of the revolutionary struggle with Great Britain combined to dramatically illustrate the ideological inconsistency of keeping slaves on the one hand while fighting for liberty on the other. On this account, abolitionist leaders—Quakers and those of other religious persuasions who now joined them—managed to convince state legislators that concern for property rights could indeed be tempered for the sake of individual liberty.

The author convincingly argues that it was ideology, not lack of profitability, which persuaded northerners to abolish slavery. The widely-held theory that northern Negro slavery was an economic liability is soundly refuted. On the contrary, Zilversmit's examination of slave prices
and values clearly demonstrate that slavery was a definite economic asset in the North at the time of the Revolution and that abolition motivated by economic considerations was the exception rather than the rule.

This is an extremely well-written and judiciously documented book. At certain points, however, the author's lack of elaboration and cursory dismissal of important factors and trends are perplexing. The reader is told, for example, that the number of slaves in Pennsylvania more closely approximated the number of slaves in New England (which, in general, was characterized by liberal slave codes) than in New Jersey and New York (both of which had relatively rigid slave codes). Despite this, Pennsylvania's slave code "hewed closely to that established in the other middle colonies." But why? The reader is left groping in the dark for an answer. Similarly, little mention is made of the clandestine continuation of the slave trade in the North even after the nefarious traffic had been outlawed. Finally, a fuller and more balanced account of the reasons why Quaker propaganda and revolutionary ideology had little effect upon the South would have been desirable. But these are minor points. What the study lacks in depth is largely erased by the clarity and forcefulness with which Zilversmit presents his case. This is a major contribution to the historiography of American Negro slavery.

Ohio Northern University

ROBERT RALPH DAVIS, JR.


Photography came of age with the outbreak of the Civil War. As a result that war is the best illustrated up to that time. Miller's monumental ten-volume Photographic History of the Civil War unquestionably ranks in a class by itself among those books which tell pictorially the story of the war solely through the camera's lens, just as The Soldier in Our Civil War is the standard for woodcuts and engravings made from the drawings of "special artists" who accompanied the armies.

With the development of modern reproduction facilities the use of original paintings and drawings, as well as photographs, became possible for authors wishing to present the war in pictures. There have been several books of this sort in recent years; the book under consideration is, I believe, the latest.

To make a rough, general division, two classes of people will read this review: the specialists who know the Civil War thoroughly—the dyed-in-the-wool buffs—and those who have a good overall knowledge of the war without the depth of the expert. I believe that the merits of this book are such that both groups will do well to find shelf space for it in their libraries.

The pictorial portion of the book presents paintings (not in color), engravings, woodcuts, drawings, photostats of posters, newspapers, etc., and—comprising a majority of the illustrations—photographs. Mr. Angle's position as former director of the Chicago Historical Society enabled him to draw largely on the resources of that well-stocked organization, and some of the illustrations will be new even to the experienced Civil War
buff. As to the other pictures, I was happy to meet again many of my favorite on-the-spot drawings by Alfred R. and William Waud, Adalbert J. Volck, and Edwin Forbes; and paintings by William L. Sheppard and Conrad W. Chapman. Of the photographs, questions might be raised regarding the accuracy of the captions of pictures on pages 110, 111, 112, 116, and 117. Certainly page 112 shows a limber, not a gun. This is a purely minor complaint; the photographs are well chosen to illustrate not only the different theaters of action but also all phases of the soldier’s life. Reproduction of recruiting posters, patriotic song title-sheets, broadsides, and other documents is more than usually generous.

In considering the writing of the story of the Civil War to accompany these illustrations it is obvious that Mr. Angle has done his homework well. In any book of this nature and length, there is the unavoidable hazard that the narrative portion will suffer at the expense of the pictorial. Usually the writer has approximately a hundred pages in which to present his story of four years of war with, in addition to the many campaigns and battles, the attendant political maneuvering and the social changes brought about by the conflict. Additionally, if he is to do the job properly, he must preface it all with an exposition of its genesis—the causes and events that led up to the war itself.

This takes a lot of doing. Granting writing skill, the primary requisites are a thorough subject knowledge and the ability to summarize and condense that knowledge without essential loss of narrative continuity. Mr. Angle comes through in these requisites with flying colors. Inevitably, the expert buff who specializes in some particular phase of the war—campaign, battle, material, or the like—will find omissions or too brief treatments, but the average non-expert’s thoughtful reading of this book will provide him with what he needs to know to understand and discuss the Civil War intelligently.

This book is not the perfect brief pictorial history of the Civil War. Minor errors prevent that: for example, the acceptance of the commonly-held legend that John Wilkes Booth died of a bullet fired by Sergeant Boston Corbett. But all in all, for handsome format and at a surprisingly low price, it is a bargain for you or for some young friend who has shown a dawning interest in the Civil War.

Harrisburg

Robert D. Hoffsommer

_Harrisburg_


Currently the United States faces serious problems as Negroes strive for improved economic, social and political position. Many Americans feel that the violence and disruption of institutions accompanying the Negro revolution are unusual. This is not the case. Gerald G. Eggert, in his study of railroad labor disputes and federal policies, 1877-1898, demonstrates once again that frequently violence, long periods of governmental indecision, and
increasing public concern have in the past characterized major shifts in group power and institutional change.

Professor Eggert reviews how the national government became involved in railroad labor disputes and what policies it developed. He also attempts to fathom the motives and influences that led policy makers to shape policies as they did. Although not without success in increasing our understanding of motivations and influences, Eggert's best contribution is his well organized and carefully developed analysis of legislative, executive and judicial efforts to formulate railroad labor policies.

Prior to 1877 the national government had not intervened in labor disputes. In that year the strike that began against the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad became the first national labor dispute where national dependence on railroads and public concern dictated intervention by the federal government. President Rutherford B. Hayes was not anxious to intervene, but when riots and looting occurred and state governors requested federal assistance, he supplied the troops that broke the strike. The federal courts became involved because they had appointed receivers for bankrupt western railroads. Judges employed precedent-setting contempt of court proceedings against strikers who disrupted court-operated roads. Congress made no serious attempt to deal with the problems behind the crisis.

In 1885 the Knights of Labor directed a successful strike against Jay Gould's western lines, but in a new strike the next year Gould turned a labor victory into defeat through court action. Federal judges expanded on the 1877 contempt doctrines which had claimed that employees of roads in receivership were officers of the court and responsible to it for their conduct. In 1886, for the first time, a U. S. circuit court judge issued a temporary injunction to prevent workers from interfering with commerce on a railroad not in receivership, but the strike ended before the injunction received a real test. Congress investigated and debated and President Grover Cleveland recommended the establishment of a permanent arbitration commission and voluntary arbitration, but no action resulted.

An 1888 strike on the Burlington line again brought major national attention to railroad labor problems. Federal judges issued sweeping injunctions prohibiting secondary boycotts, no longer restricting themselves to railroads in receivership. Attempts by the postmaster general and the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish a policy of government neutrality failed. However, Congressional demands for action led to the passage of a weak voluntary arbitration bill.

The most active federal intervention occurred in the famous 1894 Pullman strike. Judges used injunctions and contempt proceedings widely. Interference with interstate commerce and the 1890 Sherman Antitrust Act became the basis for injunctions. In 1895 the Supreme Court upheld the issuance of injunctions under the commerce power. The Cleveland administration, having already used troops in dispersing Coxey's Army, proceeded to a distinctly anti-labor policy. Under the direction of Attorney General Richard Olney federal troops were employed to uphold court injunctions even when state governors were actively opposed. Olney also applied a
policy first formulated in the 1894 Great Northern strike. Strikers could not interfere with any trains that had mail cars attached. Although Congress upheld presidential actions by resolution, increasing criticism developed over the use of injunctions and troops in railway labor disputes. In 1898 Congress finally enacted a revised arbitration and mediation bill.

After the Pullman strike the widely-held assumption that the government would not tolerate national railroad strikes gave new stature to collective bargaining, conciliation and mediation. Political leaders and the public had become sensitive to naked antilabor intervention and the need to compensate labor for its loss of the right to strike.

Professor Eggert's attempt to determine motives and influences adds a valuable dimension to his work. Where he has benefit of considerable and varied sources, as with Cleveland and William Howard Taft, he deals adequately with the complexities of influence and motivation. However, even in his perceptive analysis of Olney, based in part on his doctoral dissertation, he recognizes that motivation sometimes can "only be guessed." For numerous judges and minor officials Eggert documents ties to the railroads and other valuable information but is forced to leave conclusions on influences and motivations mostly to implication.

One of Eggert's most important assumptions is that both American capitalism and democracy have been strengthened by the sharing of economic power by labor and capital. While the assumption may accurately describe what has happened, the application of it leads to some unduly harsh historical judgments. Eggert is critical of presidents, judges, congressmen and others for failing to see the benefits of a powerful labor movement in a democratic society and for dealing with crises, but not with underlying problems. Yet it is too much to expect that in the late nineteenth century successful lawyers, judges and politicians would propose or accept the idea that democracy and capitalism would be strengthened by a strong labor movement when they themselves had attained success through values and institutions which rejected such ideas. The insight that comes from the struggle to formulate federal labor policies in this period is that only through a series of crises and pressures did both the public and its leaders gradually awaken to the need for changing institutions to meet changed conditions.

Professor Eggert draws on a rich variety of manuscripts, documents, newspapers, court cases and secondary sources. Regrettably the publishers have chosen to place the footnotes at the end of the volume even though many contain information which adds meaning to the text.

The specialized nature of this study will probably confine its appeal primarily to historians and scholars interested in railroads, labor policy and nineteenth century economic developments. This is unfortunate. Labor's struggle to achieve power and rights, and the effort of government to formulate policy to meet the challenge of change has significant implications for current American society that merit a wider consideration of this book.

Otterbein College

THOMAS J. KERR
PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY STUDIES

The Pennsylvania Historical Association has available copies of several numbers of the Pennsylvania Historical Studies, including the new booklets by Ira Brown on Pennsylvania Reform and Reformers and by William A. Russ, Jr., on Pennsylvania’s Boundaries. 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)
_________ Brown, Pennsylvania Reform and Reformers ($0.75)
_________ Russ, Pennsylvania’s Boundaries ($0.75)

To be mailed to (PLEASE PRINT):
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