
For Benjamin Franklin 1764 constituted part of a brief American interlude between his two London agencies. For the empire it was a prelude to the intra-imperial crisis. It was also a year in which Franklin's attention, and consequently his papers, focused almost entirely on either internal provincial politics or the relation of Pennsylvania to the Proprietor and the Crown. Volume XI contains the papers of this year alone and it is the first of the series to cover only a single year. The amount of Franklin's correspondence has not increased; rather, the pamphleteering of an election year explains the increased bulk.

Four Franklin tracts, all well known and germane to Pennsylvania affairs, appear in this stout volume. "A Narrative of the Late Massacres" indicts the murderers of the Conestoga Indians as betrayers of solemn covenants entered into by a civilized society and paves the way for tracing Franklin's role in suppressing the Paxton Rebellion. In the hot war over the project for royal displacement of the proprietary government, "Cool Thoughts on the Present Situation of our Public Affairs" supplements Franklin's "Explanatory Remarks on the Assemblies Resolves of March 24." The final exchange in the year's tractarian skirmishes began with Franklin's "Preface" to the printed version of Joseph Galloway's Speech to the Assembly. His "Preface" not only exceeded Galloway's remarks in length but provoked an extensive response by William Smith, "An Answer to Mr. Franklin's Remarks."

The comprehensive editorial introductions and footnotes in this volume continue the standards of excellence to which readers of the series have become accustomed. The inclusion of direct responses to Franklin's published political essays adds to the completeness of the Papers and the convenience of the reader. Inevitably, however, such liberal canons of relevance produce editorial decisions to include materials which other editors might omit. For this volume that point is reached in the case of the Franklin "Preface . . ." when the "Advertisement" printed between the Franklin and the Galloway materials in the original is included on the ground that it "is not wholly clear whether Franklin or Galloway" was the author.

The correspondence of the year is inherently political, reflecting the rapid turning of the wheel of fortune: Franklin succeeded Norris as Speaker; presided over the turbulent Assembly which formulated a petition to the King seeking establishment of royal government for the province; lost
his seat in the heated election which followed; and circumvented this reverse
by being selected as the Assembly's agent for presenting the petition at
court. As the year and the volume close, Franklin, has safely crossed the
Atlantic and has again taken up his accustomed London lodgings.

The complexity of personal and factional inter-relations within the
province is amply demonstrated in the documents and traced in the
editorial notes. Temporarily the threat of civil disorders posed by the
Conestoga massacres and the march of the Paxton Boys overrode the
divisions between Governor John Penn and his fractious assembly. Fol-
lowing passage of a Riot Act, Franklin and the Governor cooperated in
marshaling Philadelphia's defenses and diverting the insurgents. Yet scarcely
a month after the crisis, savoring the irony, Franklin could write to John
Fothergill, "And, would you think it, this Proprietary Governor did me
the Honour, on an Alarm, to run to my House at Midnight, with his
Counsellors at his Heels, for Advice, and made it his Head Quarters for
some time: And within four and twenty Hours your old Friend was a
common Soldier, A Counsellor, a kind of Dictator, an Ambassador to the
Country Mob, and on their returning home, Nobody again." Less than two
months elapsed between those events and the adoption by the Assembly, at
Franklin's instigation, of a resolution developing the case against proprietary
rule and laying the groundwork for the petition to establish royal govern-
ment in Pennsylvania.

Portents of the imperial crisis may be found, but at this time, of course,
neither Franklin nor his correspondents yet sensed their implications. The
index contains perhaps a quarter column of references to a projected stamp
act. A Massachusetts Committee of Correspondence addressed Franklin, as
"Speaker," recommending a united colonial "remonstrance" against the
Sugar Act. But for Franklin post office affairs, including the accounts of
his deputies, the effects of new restrictions on franking privileges, and
proposals of a new scale of postal rates in America occupied far more space
and had at least as much priority. In 1764 Franklin lived in an America
where service to the Crown was still a way to advance one's career.

The year 1764 was not particularly productive of scientific materials;
they are few, and largely they report observations of others. Franklin's
comments range from methods for picking sturgeon to an undated letter
concerning the problems involved in setting a ballad to music. The Franklin
of this volume nears mid-career as a public figure. His world is neither
that of the Junto and Poor Richard nor is it yet that of the diplomatist,
national leader and sage.

Dickinson College

Christopher Dock, Colonial Schoolmaster; The Biography and Writings of
Christopher Dock. By Gerald C. Studer. (Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press,

Students of colonial Pennsylvania history will applaud the appearance of
a much-needed biography of Christopher Dock. Gerald C. Studer examines
many long-standing questions concerning the intent schoolmaster whose foresight and understanding yielded precepts which were centuries ahead of his time. In particular we are indebted to author and publisher for presenting in accurate translation the basic works of this unusual teacher. It serves as a useful reminder that current concerns for the needs and welfare of the individual pupil are not as innovative as we are tempted to believe. Of course, Dock's essentially pietist basis of his method would arouse criticism in today's world.

In this work, Mr. Studer has attempted to perceive the man and his mission in a society that did not fully appreciate him. That he carried on his innovations in German-language schools in English-speaking Pennsylvania is a tribute to the Pennsylvania experiment, but it has also contributed to the neglect Dock suffered in subsequent Pennsylvania history. Limited sources and a lack of substantive material still present a great handicap to the biographer of Christopher Dock. Studer resolves this matter by an almost equal division of the book: first, the biography, then a rather complete compendium of Dock's writings. The author's choice of authorities jolts the scholarly reader, as he juxtaposes contemporary accounts of Dock with offhand statements from textbooks on educational method, or from a *Cyclopedia of Education*. Newspaperman Christopher Sauer's judgments on his friend Dock and the fictional Eli Schrawder's thoughts occur as almost equally valid assessments.

In marked contrast, the author makes the best possible use of an often overlooked source, the delightful and informative discoveries of such local historians as John D. Souder and Alan Keyser, to cite two different generations. Appropriate recognition of their accomplishments is long overdue, an oversight this book attempts to rectify.

A few curious omissions may distress the reader. In Studer's chapter on colonial schools there is no mention of Michael Schlatter's 1750 Charity School proposals for the German element in Pennsylvania. Surely Dock was aware of the plan proposed by Schlatter. He must have known that many German Pennsylvanians severely objected to its excessive concessions to English control. Dock may not have expressed his views, or they may have been lost, but the omission of the hottest educational topic among Dock's compatriots is regrettable.

Did Dock share the admiration and respect that pietists Francis Daniel Pastorius, Christopher Sauer, Jr., and Christopher Schultz showed their Quaker contemporaries? How did he feel about provincial politics which threatened political guarantees in 1764? Since Dock associated with Dutch Mennonites especially, may he have been Dutch rather than German? Was it really necessary to tamper with Dock's signature for the purpose of a book cover? Why anglicize “Christoph” to a form Dock himself never used?

The author's comment about Christopher Duke of Württemberg assumes too little reader understanding; and in his statement concerning printing problems, "Franklin apparently at that time controlled the entire available paper supply," the author assumes too much. The use of Compayre's *History of Pedagogy* (1897) as a source of quotations from Desiderius Erasmus...
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demonstrates a recurring weakness in sources. Although Studer has consi-
sidered some early American sources, he has overlooked numerous others.
This biography of Christopher Dock often lapses into a history of educa-
tion or a history of Mennonite thought, although that may well reflect the
scarcity of sources on Dock himself.

In general, there emerges a sympathetic, understanding picture of the
quiet, self-effacing Christopher Dock; we come to better understand the
man and his ideals. Occasionally Studer's style is obscure and repetitious,
but he may simply have absorbed too thoroughly Dock's own eighteenth
century prose forms. It is gratifying to have Dock's *Schul-Ordnung* easily
available again in a form which may intrigue still another generation of
prospective teachers. The author has added to the value of the work by
his use of page headings to assist the reader. His bibliography collates
materials from widely divergent sources. Pertinent end-papers and other
clear maps also enhance the value of the book.

*Ursinus College*  

WILLIAM T. PARSONS

_The War for America, 1775-1783._ By Piers Mackesy. (Cambridge: Harvard
University Press, 1965. Pp. 565. $10.00.)

This is a good old-fashioned piece of narrative history, which takes one
step backward before taking two steps forward. It speculates upon the
might-have-beens, unashamedly assesses character, makes moral judgments,
justifies heroes, and takes sides. Quaintly, the moral standards applied to
one side are also applied to the other, although "the other side" is the
perspective from which Piers Mackesy (Fellow of Pembroke College,
Oxford) writes.

Although this perspective may hold few surprises for the specialist, for
any American it will be a bit of a shock to see George III and Lord
George Germain as heroes of the piece. Mackesy comes from a military
family, both father and grandfather were generals, and his loyalty to king
and country, together with his seemingly inherited familiarity with the
difficulties of command decisions, gives the book an eighteenth century
charm, which softens an American reader's reaction to such judgments as
"the American negotiators . . . [were] shrewd, hard men for whom raison
d'etat was as decisive a consideration as it was for the more experienced
French." Indeed, Mackesy's picture of men in the political and military
administration struggling against the muddle of circumstances arouses the
reader's sympathies as it completes his stated purpose: "The first purpose
of this book is to examine the making and execution of strategy in one of
England's great eighteenth-century wars, and to create a detailed model
of the machine at work; the second, to judge a war Ministry in the light
of circumstances rather than results."

On the British side the American war was a limited one. The military
were limited by the objective of bringing the colonies back to their allegiance
to the crown. Administration was limited by an inherited inefficient
machinery. Government was limited by an opposition determined to end the
American war and break the King’s political patronage. Policy was limited by miscalculations concerning the strength of the loyalists and the vitality of what in Mackesy’s eyes is still, the “rebel” militia. These limitations were sufficient, when the naval balance of power was momentarily tipped in favor of Britain’s enemies, to break the nation’s will to continue fighting after the defeat at Yorktown.

On the rebel side there were no limits. The British were fighting according to the rules of eighteenth century warfare, while the rebels were fighting for independence. In the colonies the war took on the fanaticism of a civil war, trembling “constantly on the knife-edge between civilized conventions and atrocious barbarity.” The loyalists subjected the government to a “looking-glass world in which rebels are fiends incarnate, and the British generals avoid victory in order to line their pockets with bribes and plunder or to favour the political Opposition at home.” Shortly before Yorktown not only the British but the French as well expected American resistance to collapse, but neither counted on a phenomenon that recurred throughout the war: wherever Washington’s army appeared, “around the Continentals gathered the hordes of militia, to be defeated and dispersed at great cost in British lives, only to assemble again as soon as the Continentals rallied.” The weakness of the rebels, reckoned by any eighteenth century standard, turned out to be their strength in the actual circumstances.

Interestingly, Mackesy’s view of the war parallels views that were formed immediately after the war was over. Charles Stedman, a native American, who served under Howe, Clinton, and Cornwallis, attributed British failure—in spite of the “gallant efforts” of the army and navy, the “justice of their cause,” the “firmness of their sovereign,” and the “general vows of the people”—to the weakness of the administration, and the violence of the opposition in Parliament, which, together with weak leadership and favoritism in the army, prevented effective action by adopting “temporary expedients.” Although Mackesy refers to Stedman once in the text, his does not cite *The History of the Origin, Progress, and Termination of the American War* (2 vols.; Dublin, 1794). Stedman’s view of weak leadership adopting temporary expedients has been the standard view of North’s administration. By viewing the problems from the perspective of the men who faced them, Mackesy has made us understand them as men, but sympathy does not remove the validity of the charge that they were weak.

The notion that military weakness was a revolutionary strength was common enough immediately after the Revolution for the patriot historians, John Marshall (*Life of George Washington* [5 vols.; Philadelphia, 1804-07]), David Ramsay (*The History of the American Revolution* [2 vols.; Philadelphia, 1789]), and Mercy Otis Warren (*History of the Rise, Progress and Termination of the American Revolution* [3 vols.; Boston, 1805]) to discuss it explicitly. Only the extreme republican, Mrs. Warren, saw strength in America’s military weakness, while the two federalists regretted the necessary reliance on militia. All three agreed, however, that victory
for America consisted in breaking the British will to fight on, which Mackesy's study corroborates.

Although one can see in a book like Mackesy's how easy it might have been for the Revolution to wither away—just a few changed circumstances here and there—yet there is a certain inevitability about the progress of events given the initial British decision to fight a limited war. As Mackesy puts it, "a war of unlimited destruction was ruled out. There were limits to what conscience and policy would allow." The mightiest nation in the world, after the Seven Years' War, could easily have crushed the colonies had strength been the only consideration. Since it was not, it is difficult to see how force could have brought the Americans back to their allegiance, even though probably no more than a third of the population was actively supporting the Revolution at any one time (for one should remember that that third was not composed of the same people all of the time).

In spite of what we know today of the sordid motives of the Rockingham group, their goal of ending the American war was the most sensible British policy. The American Revolutionaries (the proper term for me, even as rebels is the proper term for Mackesy) had put Great Britain in a "heads I win, tails you lose" situation. That strength can be applied effectively only against a nearly equally strong foe is perhaps one of those lessons of history that we continually look for.

Shimer College

WILLIAM R. SMITH


To help us all "become better critics" in our reading of history, this book argues the need for a method "that will not only expose an historian's assumptions," but also show, as a consequence, how he treats events by them.

The method Mr. Smith proposes is a modification, he says, of A. O. Lovejoy's method of intellectual history. He wants to retain Lovejoy's search for syntheses, but rejects his means, for Lovejoy's means are in error. They err, according to Mr. Smith, since Lovejoy's notion of a "unit-idea" rests on two faulty assumptions: first, that a unit-idea taken from one system of thought is essentially like a similar unit-idea from another, with pretty much the same meaning outside its system as in it; and secondly, that there are ideal unit-ideas outside any particular system. In an extended analogy with electronics, Mr. Smith shows us how wrong these assumptions are.

It is not clear which of several problems is Mr. Smith's main concern—correcting Lovejoy, or Page Smith; the "problem" of written history generally and how to read it; or the "problem" of the historiography of the American Revolution. The latter, I take it, is his exemplary problem, the one he chooses to apply his method to; and since "the study of American historiography takes us immediately into the problem of the
self-conscious attempt to build a model society in the United States," the particular problem he sets out to solve is "how history has been used [sic] by Americans in their self-conscious attempt to build a city on a hill."

How does Mr. Smith proceed? By examining three histories of the American Revolution: David Ramsay's (1749-1815); Mercy Otis Warren's (1724-1814); and Chief Justice John Marshall's (in his Life of George Washington)—in three successively longer chapters. A final chapter examines each history again, comparing in systematic fashion the answers found in each history to the same questions posed in each of the preceding chapters. Generous quotations and summaries from each history present their respective answers to questions about the causes, the success, the effects, the nature of the Revolution, and several corollaries to these. What does this structural plan result in? Considerable repetition. And a loss of focus on that problem about the city on a hill.

What are Mr. Smith's assumptions? The explicit one about structural integrity. Consequences? We don't get much outside the histories, which is the convention we must accept, but we are permitted to see how these three historians could agree on which events were significant yet provide different explanations of why.

Another assumption, linked to Mr. Smith's method, is not so explicit. Since his three historians "simply [my emphasis] used the educated language of their time... synthesis of their views can best be found [by] treating their histories as arguments." This judgment assumes that "educated language" will not conveniently submit to the sort of literary analysis which Mr. Smith concedes David Levin employed with some success in History as Romantic Art: Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman (Stanford, 1959). Mr. Smith consequently makes no attempt at an analysis of style, at how even an "educated" choice of diction and imagery might conceal assumptions; whereas, since it is "argument" one is concerned with, it will apparently yield to some kind of quantitative analysis (footnotes tell us what percentages of a given history are devoted to this or that explanation of events). This assumption seems to me not only faulty about the uses of language generally, but not faithful to the "convention" the book is launched upon; moreover, a dodge, particularly around Mrs. Warren who, outside the structure of her history, also wrote plays and poetry, had, that is, some claim to being "literary" as well as argumentative. But more seriously, it results in little more than summaries of the surface of discourse, and as a consequence little is "exposed" in the way of the assumptions the historians had which is not already quite evident in what they said.

Mr. Smith's conclusion that the Revolutionary generation succeeded in establishing an enduring government because its members were bound together (despite their differences over particular events) in "an overlapping ground of agreement, [and by] a vocabulary of republicanism..." is a conclusion others have arrived at by other means examining other sources. This is, I suppose, some vindication of his method. Still, it seems to me a conclusion that begs an important historical question, especially if
we’re seeking to solve the problem of how the notion of America as a city on a hill got into histories. Where did the vocabulary of republicanism come from? Structural analysis will not get us very far in answering a question it is prevented from raising. We would have to go outside the structure.

Mr. Smith’s aim at making us all better readers is laudable and always in order. That’s where we start, with due respect to the text and its structural integrity, as the New Critics in literary studies have been teaching us for several decades now. One wishes Mr. Smith had either gone further, and been as respectful as some New Critics have been of texture as well as text, and of structure conceived as form and design as well as “interaction,” or had limited himself to his final chapter (which is highly informative as it stands) and protested less about method and Lovejoy’s making systems of thought “inert.” Lovejoy’s analogy with chemical compounds is at least a little more consistent with Mr. Smith’s statement that “systems of thought . . . are vital [emphasis mine] structures” than is an analogy with electronics.

Lafayette College

J. R. VITELLI


By now most of the immigrant groups have had their histories written. Much of the writing has been parochial and pietistic; a little has been very good. Some authors—Marcus Hansen, Rowland Berthoff, and Barbara Solomon are names which come immediately to mind—have produced discriminating studies which greatly increase our understanding of immigrants and their interactions with American society. Rather surprisingly the Welsh have not been well served, with the exception of some passages in Berthoff’s book. They have waited long for their historian, and after Professor Hartmann’s effort are, in many ways, still waiting.

Although some fifteen years were spent on research for this work, it shows very little originality. At nearly every point the author has been content to rest on the narratives of others. Since most of his predecessors were local men concerned with local affairs and given to lauding their religious and national affiliations at a considerable price in perspective, the result is not entirely satisfactory. For himself, he has skirted the hagiographical traps by keeping analysis and interpretation to a minimum.

After a chapter on the Welsh Indian legend, which does not take us a step beyond the more graceful articles of David Williams which appeared in the *American Historical Review* twenty years ago, there are stolid accounts of Welsh settlements and Welsh religious, journalistic and cultural institutions in America. In an unexciting, inelegantly written book there is not a trace of “hwyl,” that sparkling gusto with which the best Welsh preachers delivered sermons of remarkably tough intellectual fibre. The book closes with a series of appendices listing the churches founded by the Welsh in America, existing Welsh-American social organizations, and
distinguished Welsh-Americans. The bibliography is long and will be a useful starting point for anyone who wishes to write a penetrating and sophisticated analysis of the roles played by the Welsh in American history.

*Richmond College of The City University of New York*  
G. N. D. Evans


From the Elk River in Maryland the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal cuts across the waist of the State of Delaware to Delaware City on the bay of the same name. Only about fourteen miles long, it provides an alternative route to the more than three hundred miles by sea from Baltimore to Philadelphia. Although the canal is located in Maryland and Delaware, the citizens of a third state took the leading part in its realization. Philadelphia businessmen promoted the idea, secured the necessary privileges, including freedom from taxation in Maryland and Delaware, lobbied successfully for federal funds, directed the building of the canal, raised much of the private capital, and chose the managers of the completed project.

Extensive land holdings by Pennsylvanians along the line of the projected canal provided an economic incentive for some of the early agitation for the building of the waterway. But much more important, as time went on, was the determination of Philadelphia business interests to divert from Baltimore to Philadelphia the rich and rapidly growing exports of the Susquehanna River Valley—the lumber and grain which found its cheapest route to market down the Susquehanna River to the Chesapeake.

In many respects the history of the Chesapeake and Delaware parallels that of other early canals. Its promoters grossly underestimated the cost of construction and disputes over alternate routes, shortage of capital, and unanticipated engineering difficulties repeatedly hindered completion. The canal was finally opened for business in 1829, but too much water, too little water, and earth slides repeatedly disrupted traffic and swallowed revenues. And with increasing business the ever-recurring need to enlarge the channel and rebuild the wooden locks and bridges forced the management to seek additional capital. However, unlike most of the early canals, the Chesapeake and Delaware did manage to survive railroad competition. Repeatedly enlarged and improved, it serves today as perhaps the most important link in the inland waterway route along the Atlantic Coast. In 1919, after taking over the canal from its corporate owners, the federal government enlarged and converted it into a sea-level waterway. Made larger again in the 1930's, the canal has recently undergone its third reconstruction since the federal government took it over. The dimensions of the original canal as built in 1829, 10 feet deep and 66 feet wide, may be compared with those for the current rebuilding, 35 feet deep and 450 feet wide.

Gray tells the history of the waterway from the first movement for its
construction in the 1760's down to the present. He examines the part played by the leading promoters and officers of the canal company, the often bitter rivalries of persons and communities, the physical and financial difficulties met and overcome, and the persistently troublesome legal and political problems arising out of the necessity of dealing with two states and the federal government. For much of the nearly two hundred years covered by this study, manuscript, legislative, and judicial records are unusually abundant. The author has skillfully mastered these materials and tells his story with an appealing directness and a confident momentum.

It is true that the reviewer, like others of his picky ilk, does find some grounds for cavil. Gray gives relatively limited attention to the economic significance of the canal. For example, did its economic advantages exceed its costs? And why does the author so completely withhold judgment as to the business management of the canal company? He does tell the story of how it was discovered in 1886 that two officers of the corporation had issued over $600,000 of unauthorized bonds over a period of 24 years and in addition had appropriated to their own use more than $100,000 of the company's funds. How could peculations of this magnitude extending over nearly a quarter of a century have been possible? The question is not raised.

But this study is a major contribution—a worthy companion to be placed on the same shelf along side excellent studies already available for the Chesapeake and Ohio and the Erie Canals.

Eldenrier Mills-Hagley Foundation, Inc.  

GEORGE ROGERS TAYLOR


In his author's note Robert McClellan emphasizes his subtitle by saying, "I am a painter, not a writer." It seems only fair to consider his book on that basis. In his preferred profession he is thoroughly at home. His wealth of wash drawings, diagrams and maps, printed in sepia, reveal knowledge, respect, and affection for the Delaware Division Canal, the countryside, and the people, living and dead, who contributed to this present historic remnant of a once vital and thriving artery of commerce. To this reviewer's knowledge Robert McClellan is the first to assemble material from many and often contradictory sources and present it with graphic illustrations. That there are errors is inevitable but his courage in attempting to reduce this mass of material to one hundred eleven pages must be admired. Even with its deficiencies the book is a valuable contribution to canal history.

Following a foreword by Maurice K. Goddard, Secretary of Forests and Waters, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the book is divided into three sections. The first, "The Coming of the Canal," reviews early navigation on the Delaware River, the evolution of the eastern Pennsylvania canal system, the construction of the Delaware Division, its hundred years of operation, ultimate obsolescence, and present restoration by the Commonwealth. Being only a summary and suffering from the generic problem of
all condensations—what to include and what to omit, with sometimes a resultant false emphasis—this section has little value for the serious historian except possibly as an introduction to the subject.

The second section, “A Trip on the Canal,” traces an imaginary journey by canal boat at the turn of the century from Easton to New Hope and across the Delaware River to the Raritan feeder canal. Here extensive research is obvious. Relying upon written material, the recollections of a group of still-living canalers, and personal examination of canal vestiges, Mr. McClellan has drawn, with little artistic license, pictures of locks, the fall and wicket gates—open and closed—and the machinery which operated them. These are supplemented by a drawing of the system of locks at New Hope, pictures of boats in the locks and crossing the river, and a profile drawing of Lock No. 9 showing water levels during the passage of a boat. To a student of canal technology the pictures and drawings should be valuable, though they are arranged with aggravating lack of continuity or relation to the text. Unfortunately some of the captions are obscure, misleading, and a few are incomplete or incorrect.

The concluding section, “Life on the Canal,” combines descriptions of working and living conditions and canal maintenance with yarns, anecdotes and reminiscences of living canal people, most of whom are seventy to ninety years of age. They are given reality by a series of seven portraits. It was from the memories and experiences of these canal families that much of the author’s material, not available from written sources, was obtained. There emerges a recollection of rugged individuals who worked hard, played hard, and brought to their arduous tasks generous portions of robust, earthy humor. This, too, is important.

Mr. McClellan has included a glossary of canal terms, and an appendix which contains a sampling of engineers’ drawings, a table of distances and a rate schedule. The absence of a bibliography will be especially disappointing to the researcher who would like to consult the author’s printed sources. However, regardless of this book’s insufficiencies and discrepancies, its excellent illustrations and first-hand information merit the attention of the historian of canal transportation in Pennsylvania.

The Mercer Museum


This short biography of Charles Willson Peale reads easily, in part, surely, because Peale must have been a pleasure to know. Mr. Plate recapitulates the story of Peale’s career as already told in much richer detail in Charles Coleman Sellers’s definitive two-volume study, Charles Willson Peale, published in 1947. The author readily acknowledges Sellers’s contribution in the introduction and in the short but carefully selected bibliography. Mr. Plate’s purpose, therefore, is to make this material more readily available to a wider audience. In a comparatively short space he
tells the story of Peale’s apprentice training, his involvement with the Sons of Liberty movement, his war experiences, the family life around which Peale’s life revolved, his career as a painter and as a museum keeper, and he hints at the wide variety of Peale’s peripheral interests in things such as hygiene and medicine, tools and inventions, agriculture, and even the manufacture of false teeth.

To write a biography of Peale requires selection from voluminous materials, most of which are in the Peale-Sellers Collection in the Library of the American Philosophical Society. Here are manuscript memoirs written in 1826 by Peale when he was an old man, diaries and journals covering intermittently the years 1799 to 1826, and letterbooks containing drafts or copies of letters written from 1791 to only three days before his death on February 22, 1827. The materials are so fresh and quotable they almost write the book; by judicious use of these the author communicates a sense of direct acquaintance with Peale.

Typical of Peale’s many interests is the fact that from January 2, 1803, to 1827, all the letters in the Peale-Sellers Collection are copies, thanks to Peale’s use of the polygraph, an invention of an Englishman, John Isaac Hawkins. Peale, who was a craftsman to his finger-tips, was fascinated by this gadget and prompted its use. In this he was unsuccessful for he was far from being a shrewd man of business. However, he communicated his enthusiasm to his friends Benjamin Henry Latrobe, the architect, and Thomas Jefferson. It is thanks to their use of this, as well as Peale’s, that we have such complete records of the lives of these three distinguished men, each interested in varying degrees in art—painting and architecture, science—natural history, agriculture and engineering, and political action and theory.

Peale made his living first as a painter, and then as the director and keeper of his private museum—one of the earliest of its kind and no doubt the most important of the time. Peale’s artistic accomplishments have been treated by Sellers in his *Portraits and Miniatures by Charles Willson Peale*, 1952, in which each of his 1,046 paintings is documented as fully as possible. Mr. Plate appropriately deals with only a few of the paintings, and stresses Peale’s role as a catalyst in stimulating artistic life, the “father of art” the title suggests. Peale taught a number of his relatives to paint and draw, thus founding the Peale “dynasty” so beautifully shown at recent exhibitions at the Detroit Institute of Arts and in Utica, New York. Peale was one of the organizers in 1794 of the ill-starred Columbian, the first attempt in the United States at founding an art academy. He and other colleagues were more successful in the establishment of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts in 1805-06, now the oldest institution in the United States devoted to the fine arts. This provided a training center in America of the kind which Peale and his contemporaries could find only in Europe. Curiously relevant to the arts of the twentieth century were other artistic experiments of Peale, such as his “moving” pictures, i.e., “Perspective Views with Changeable Effects,” in which he combined transparent pictures, various lighting effects, some three-dimen-
Despite changing and eccentric enthusiasms Peale was responsible for several fairly solid contributions to scientific knowledge. His excavation of mastodon bones, as Mr. Plate points out, was important in launching the study of vertebrate paleontology. Plate also details the encouragement Peale gave to scientific-minded colleagues such as ornithologist Alexander Wilson and entomologist Thomas Say. One only has to turn the pages of Wilson and Ord’s monumental *American Ornithology*, 1804-1814, and note the number of specimens from Peale’s Museum which are cited, to realize how important were the Museum’s collections at the time. It is true, however, that Peale did not show the single mindedness necessary to most scientific and scholarly achievements. His was the role of a catalyst, as Mr. Plate indicates, rather than that of the “father” of the slightly pretentious title.

Scholars will turn to Sellers’s studies, but the intelligent lay reader, the high school student, and the historian or scholar who wishes to review quickly certain phases of Peale’s career will find this book useful.

Newcomb College, Tulane University

JESSIE POESCH


A scholarly full-scale biography of Lincoln’s Secretary of State and the negotiator of the Alaska Purchase has long been needed. Glyndon G. Van Deusen, Research Professor of History Emeritus at the University of Rochester, has risen to the task by producing one of the most outstanding biographical studies of this century. Van Deusen’s *William Henry Seward* is based almost entirely on an impressive number of manuscript sources. Most important are the Seward Papers, a collection of some 150,000 items which the author helped acquire for the University of Rochester.

William Henry Seward was born in the village of Florida, New York, on May 16, 1801. Educated in the law, young Seward soon attained distinction in his profession. According to Van Deusen, however, Seward had no real love for the technicalities and uncertainties of the practice of law. He was repelled by its drudgery and felt it to be a barren and frustrating experience. He soon drifted into politics, for which he had a much greater liking, and early became associated with Thurlow Weed. As a “boundlessly ambitious” politician, Seward was first associated with the National Republicans and then, after 1828, with the Anti-Masonic movement. It was as an Anti-Mason that he served four years (1830-34) in the New York state senate. By 1833-34 the Anti-Masonic movement had run its course and Seward wisely allied himself with the new Whig party, which nominated him for governor in 1834. Defeated by William L. Marcy, Seward’s enthusiasm for politics was not dimmed. In 1838 he was renominated, was elected, was re-elected in 1840, and served until 1843. During his four-year tenure, Governor Seward worked tirelessly as a champion of internal improvements, prison reform, and the abolition of slavery.
Seward won national prominence during the early 1840's for his stand on the slavery controversy. His enemies were convinced that he was a fanatical antislavery firebrand of the Garrison variety. In reality, Seward was a moderate who believed that emancipation must come gradually, constitutionally, and with compensation to the slave owners. At any rate, during the 1850's, as United States Senator from New York, he gained a national reputation as the political leader of the antislavery movement. He took an extreme stand on the Kansas-Nebraska question and was visibly irritated by the Dred Scott decision, and in a speech on October 25, 1858, declared that the struggle over slavery was "an irrepressible conflict" between two antagonistic systems. By utterances such as this, Seward "became the outstanding symbol of a northern viewpoint hated and despised" by the South. Moreover, he also unwittingly created for himself an image of extremism among his fellow northerners which later proved to be politically disastrous.

Van Deusen maintains that Seward's "supposed radicalism on slavery," among other things, cost him the Republican nomination for the presidency in 1860. Party politicians were simply unwilling to nominate a candidate who had spoken in terms that seemed to promise extreme and immediate action on the slavery issue. They "were anxious to enhance the party's chances in the border slave states, and to ensure victory in Illinois and Indiana where there was strong pro-slavery sentiment." Accordingly, they nominated Lincoln, whose public statements in regard to slavery were distinctly more moderate and conservative.

Although the loss of the Republican nomination was a bitter disappointment for Seward, he nevertheless remained an extremely ambitious man. His ambitions were partially realized when he was appointed Secretary of State in the new Lincoln administration. It was as Secretary of State that Seward left an indelible impression upon the fabric of American history.

Throughout the period of the Civil War Seward successfully maintained American rights and preserved American prestige abroad. During these years he settled the intricate Alabama claims against Great Britain, demonstrated "diplomacy of a high order" in regard to the French intervention in Mexico, and initiated a constructive and farsighted Latin American policy.

Van Deusen concludes that Seward has earned a special niche among the great American secretaries of state not so much for his actions but rather for his tremendous vision and foresight. Seward was a "peaceful expansionist," who believed that the United States was "the evangel of a democratic 'imperialism' which would first expand its economic influence and then its way of life across the globe." The acquisition of Russian America (Alaska) in 1867 was indicative of this vision, but the Secretary of State also pointed the way for acquisition of the Virgin Islands, contemplated the possibility of a canal across Central America, promoted the Open Door in the Far East, and gradually brought Hawaii within the American sphere of influence. This, according to Professor Van Deusen,
"was no mean achievement for the little statesman from Auburn, New York."

Ohio Northern University  
Robert Ralph Davis, Jr.


Whenever a man who reaches political prominence undertakes to keep a diary, the hopes of historians are raised. They will have a greater chance to learn the reasons for things because someone "on the inside" is going to make revelations. In American history John Quincy Adams, James K. Polk and Gideon Welles produced such records in extenso. Now the work of another man, James A. Garfield, of at least sufficient stature to become President of the United States, extending in broken series from his seventeenth year until his assassination at the age of fifty is in process of publication. Two volumes covering through his forty-third birthday are the first installment.

Garfield began as a "line a day" diarist and it was not until he became a Congressman and Committee Chairman as he passed forty that his jottings reach any real bulk. But it is remarkable that one who wrote so little revealed so much. He grew up in a farm community in the Western Reserve of Ohio. He was less a farmer and more of a laborer and carpenter who was the main support of a widowed mother, living at least in the early years in a log cabin. At the age of eighteen he was attracted to the water, and having secured employment on a canal boat, looked forward, at least briefly, to eventually going to sea. However, a severe bout with malaria brought him back to his mother's farm, and her influence and that of a rural schoolteacher plus physical incapacity following his illness led him to seek education.

He went to two religious academies for several of their short terms and supported himself by severe manual labor for a few weeks each year and by teaching in "red schoolhouses." In these years from 1848 to 1855 he experienced religion as a Campbellite, Disciple of Christ, and associated intimately with them in constant exercises of worship in which he developed a proficiency as a lay preacher and student of the classics. He implies rather than describes struggles with and conquest of sin, and uncertainties about sex which seem to have delayed and threatened what eventually became a happy and fruitful marriage. In the meantime he decided to leave rural Reserve academies and denominational schools and go to Williams College, presided over by Mark Hopkins. Here all may regret he kept practically no record of what must have been a vital period in his life.

As he started out in life with the belief that a Christian should not be politically involved, we really learn very little about how he came to be so deeply committed and have to ponder over significant soliloquies about his uncertainties as to whether he was honest. He studied law under circumstances about which we learn little. Then came the Civil War and
his military service as a regimental and brigade commander of Ohio troops, climaxing in the Chickamauga campaign. We learn from these pages next to nothing of all of this nor of how or why he ran for Congress in 1862, nor of his first decade of service in Washington.

When he really begins to keep something like an extensive diary, he has reached his fortieth year, has been to Europe for a grand tour and produced a very interesting account of it. He is now a great reader who amazes us with the nature and extent of his reading. How a man so involved in life could read so much and so many books of such good quality is amazing and makes him more of an enigma.

By the time he has served ten years in Congress he reveals a capacity for tremendous work as a responsible committee chairman who despite all his religion and his experience has a surprising naivete which permits him to be involved in such unfortunate episodes as the Credit Mobilier, the Salary Grab, and the DeGolyer paving contract. He is much troubled about these, particularly by the use made of them by his opponents. But we do not have any further written soliloquies about his honesty, and as his Congressional district was so solidly Republican that he was unbeatable, he did not suffer materially from these errors in judgment. The second volume ends with the resounding Republican defeat of 1874, in the midst of which he was one of the survivors.

From this second volume we learn so much that we are exasperated that we learn so little. We view the intimate activity of the powerful chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations but are denied any penetrating analysis of the reason for things or the nature of most of the influences at work. Hundreds of conferences and dialogues are mentioned but never a word of their content. Hundreds of individuals are mentioned but hardly ever characterized. Some glimpses are given of President Grant and his queer assortment of associates but we learn little of what they were or how Garfield appraised them. But we do learn of the tremendous load of work he carried, his constant bouts with nervous dyspepsia, his attempts to cure them by horseback riding and the almost unbelievable amount of reading of good literature which he accomplished when he was exhausted. Also it must not be forgotten that he preserved his voluminous correspondence which, together with the diaries, is in the Library of Congress. Although Garfield really did not confide in his diary, he revealed much of himself and for that we are grateful to his family and his careful editors and for sharing all this with the historian.

University of Pennsylvania

Roy F. Nichols


As with many artists, the reputation of John Rogers rose, fell away, and is currently seeking its proper level; the famous Rogers groups have moved from parlor to garret to museum. In his critical analysis, Mr. Wallace explicitly and by implication attempts to offer judgment on two main points.
One is an evaluation of Rogers' place in the history of American culture and his contribution to American art. The other is an examination of Rogers and his work in relation to the dichotomy between fine or high art and popular culture. That such an analysis is worth doing need not be questioned if only on the ground that art and artifact on all levels reveal something pertinent to cultural development. But Mr. Wallace is convincing also in his contention that these groups are works of art in their own right.

It is striking to note the rather uneasy opinion that Rogers himself held—striking since we tend to look at awareness of the difference between high and popular art and the alienation of the artist from society as twentieth century phenomena. Clearly Rogers' fame was popular and clearly his art was not alien to his society. But the question, then as now, was—Is it art? In spite of several factors, including strong convictions, Rogers made several attempts to attain the level of unquestioned high art. Fortunately he had sense enough to appreciate his own gifts and limitations and continued the kind of work that he could do best. As important a critic as James Jackson Jarves felt that his work was truly art and at Rogers' death, the younger sculptors firmly believed that he had, if nothing else, pioneered in breaking with an increasingly sterile neoclassicism and had built a public for sculpture.

Wallace places Rogers among the realists, making lively comparisons with literary figures like Howells and Garland and artists like the early Winslow Homer. He is sound in locating Rogers on a lesser level than these men but in refusing to classify him with James Whitcomb Riley. Or, in general terms, Wallace is correct in his feeling that Rogers worked with his subject matter for its inherent values, not for exploitation of its quaintness. Mr. Wallace might have done more along the same lines with similar comparisons between Rogers and painters like William S. Mount, George Caleb Bingham, and Eastman Johnson. Possibly the connections between the arts make painting and sculpture no closer than literature and sculpture but convention leads us to feel otherwise. As Wallace notes, comparisons with other sculptors is nearly impossible; except in a small way they did not attempt realism. Jarves noted that Rogers stood alone.

When reading Mr. Wallace's book straight through, one is tempted to question the format to a small degree. At the same time, it is difficult to see how it might be changed without limiting the book's usefulness. Wallace presents first the text, then a complete catalog of Rogers' works with pictures, technical data, and historical and critical comment. This leads to a great deal of repetition: the same material appears, often verbatim, in both sections. However, as a reference for collectors and students, the catalog would be inadequate were this material omitted. And certainly no reader would ask that it be deleted from the main text.

All in all, Mr. Wallace has produced what can probably be called a definitive work. His book reflects remarkably the spirit of its subject in that it manages to occupy the middle ground looking toward the scholar on the one hand and popular appeal on the other. Like his subject, Mr. Wallace exposes himself to the disadvantages of this position; it is to his
credit that the result provides a common denominator which does not

sacrifice to either side.

Lafayette College

GEORGE P. WINSTON

The Mechanical Engineer in America, 1830-1910. By Monte A. Calvert.


No occupational group can be more obsessed with its professional stand-

ing in the eyes of the public than engineers are today. That this obsession

is one of long standing is demonstrated in Calvert's book, which is the

first critical history to be written of an American engineering society.

One who has read current engineering periodicals over the last thirty

eyears cannot help but be aware of the constant complaining that goes on

because engineers are not adequately appreciated by the public. Within

recent years two separate public relations campaigns have been mounted

by engineering societies to tell the public how important engineers really are.

If the engineer will read the explicit statements in this book, which he

will find supported by the more than ample periodical and manuscript

sources cited by the author, he will find that the pattern of self-conscious

concern for status and deference were well established eighty years ago.

While there have been minor changes in emphasis, the response of engineer-

ing societies to the culture in which they operate has changed very little.

In the period described by Calvert, successful mechanical engineers were

generally those who had served an apprenticeship in the techniques of

engineering—drafting, designing and developing new devices, and super-

vising construction of machines—but who had then moved out of the shop

into the front office of an industrial corporation. The successful ones be-

came managers of men and turned over detailed technical problems to their

apprentice engineers, who in turn looked upon their work as a way-station

in the journey toward the front office. This is still the pattern.

The other threads of the pattern can be summarized briefly. All are to

be found in this book. Engineers, on ceremonial occasions, tell other en-

gineers that engineering is the noblest profession, certainly the most

learned. Low status is uniformly deplored. Throughout its history, the

American Society of Mechanical Engineers has avoided controversial issues,

both within the society and with outsiders. The Society has always been

dominated by industrialists; it has served primarily the interests of

industry; the public interest has held an uncertain second place. A code of

ethics was mentioned from time to time, but nothing came of it before

1910. It was recognized in 1906 (as it is today) that "no code of ethics

can be enforced which conflicts with the will of the employer." The

A.S.M.E. opposed public licensing laws for engineers, and it has opposed

throughout its entire history any serious study of the merits of the metric

system of measurement. During its first thirty years, until after 1910, the
Society opposed standards (for example, screw threads and testing pro-
cedures); and it refused to become involved in movements for smoke abate-
ment or conservation of resources. Finally, continuous attention has been
given to passing along to young engineers a hearty but unreasoned hatred of labor unions.

I hope that Calvert's data will be used by the engineer to think through his basic problem, which is largely one of confusing technical proficiency with a professional outlook. The engineer's performance is flawless, runs the argument, but he is not accorded professional status. While recognizing the larger issue, the "professionalization" of which Calvert writes is a question largely of who will run the engineering society and thus determine what a man must do to be accepted as a mechanical engineer. He sees the problem of the profession as one involving a "shop culture," epitomized by leading engineers, like William Sellers, not trained in engineering schools, who operated their own machine building shops, and a "school culture," which according to Calvert wanted to set educational requirements for professional practice and to rationalize management, thus displacing the "shop-culture" manager. This framework is not flexible enough to contain the data without distortion, and it is a pity that the author is trapped into a conflict by his need for symmetry in his contending forces.

I insist that the central issue of professionalization is service in the public interest rather than educational requirements set by an engineering group. I believe that the latter is not a broad enough base for a book about professionalization. While they undoubtedly contend that all engineers should be required to have the schooling they offered, the teachers quickly came to terms with both the engineer-entrepreneurs and the non-technical managers. The authority of those who employed engineers was not questioned. Engineering schools, by and large, have considered themselves as producers of a commodity to be bought by industry. There has never been any serious questioning of the rôle of the school merely as a supplier of "what industry wants." Loyalty to industrial interests is nowhere stronger than in faculties of engineering schools, and graduates of engineering schools have embraced the industrial pattern with little complaint. Thus it seems to me that the conceptual model of conflicting cultures obscures the essential agreement of all mechanical engineers that values of the marketplace take precedence over human values.

This book demonstrates what large quantities of data may be derived from the technical periodical literature of the nineteenth century. Many fresh manuscript sources were also uncovered by Calvert. The pictures on jacket and end papers are attractive, and eight portraits of leading engineers are included, four to a page. However, a dozen other pictures of shop interiors are badly reproduced and are of questionable pertinence.

_Iowa State University_  
**Eugene S. Ferguson**
QUAKERS AND POLITICS

Pennsylvania, 1681-1726

GARY B. NASH

Beginning with the first attempts of William Penn to lay the foundations for his "holy experiment," the author shows that the Quakers repeatedly faced internal and external threats while striving to achieve religious unity and political stability. Relying primarily on manuscript collections in England and Pennsylvania, he examines the social process in early Pennsylvania, revealing how a spirit of defiance grew and transformed the style of politics from quiet deliberation to a "Rattle of Rights and Privileges."
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