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Book Review Editor's Note:

With this issue we make a change in the format of the Book Review Section to present the first in a series of essay reviews. Beginning on page 374 Editor William G. Shade contributes an essay in which he evaluates four recent studies dealing with the radical Republicans of the Reconstruction era.

Readers of PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY are invited to suggest to the Book Review Editor other subjects of major interest to students of American history that they would like to see reviewed in this manner, along with the titles of pertinent books that bear upon the subject.

Welcome also are persons proficient in special fields who will volunteer to read and report critically on the selected studies in an essay approximately fourteen hundred to eighteen hundred words in length.

The essay reviews will appear occasionally, their frequency determined by our readers' response to this innovation and by the cooperation of contributors. —NBW


Professor Gary Nash's Quakers and Politics is the finest study of the founding and early political history of Pennsylvania yet to appear. Charles P. Keith's pioneering Chronicles of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1917), useful as it still is, lacks annotation and borders on the antiquarian. Edwin B. Bronner's William Penn's "Holy Experiment" (New York, 1962) deals only with the first two decades and to some extent shares with Isaac Sharpless, A History of Quaker Government in Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1898-99) and the magisterial William R. Shepherd, History of Proprietary Government in Pennsylvania (New York, 1896), an uncritical evaluation of the role of William Penn. These studies have been conceived in a narrative or, as in the case of Shepherd, an institutional framework. Nash's work, on the other hand, though chronological in its organization, is basically analytical. Professor Nash has addressed himself to an explication of the turbulent politics of the first half century of settlement. But this is no mere chronicling of magistrates. Rather, it is an examination of governing institutions in which politics is rightly seen as a function of the ordering of society as well as social psychology and the vagaries of individual temperaments.
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In utilizing the insights of political science, sociology and psychology, Professor Nash throws new light on Pennsylvania's early development, and also, by extension, on the colonial experience elsewhere. Pennsylvania, in Nash's view, witnessed in intensified form the results of the dislocation that lay at the heart of the colonizing movement. Removal from old world moulds meant release from traditional restraints. "Antiauthoritarian tendencies," writes Nash, "and the psychological effects of the wilderness put insupportable burdens on institutions which were inherently frail, and fragile institutions encouraged resistance to authority."

In broadening his analysis to include a correlation between social outlook and political behavior, Nash may be vulnerable to criticism, although in doing so, he is responding to the recent urgent call for historians to utilize the insights of other disciplines. To Nash, the Quaker was the "supremely 'inner directed' man." He was "the epitomization of the revolutionary dynamic contained in English Protestantism." His antiauthoritarianism looms large in Nash's analysis of the factors making for political turbulence. Other factors include: (1) Penn's promotional literature raising false expectations with resultant disappointment and alienation; (2) social atomization caused by the wilderness environment; (3) the failure of institutions, including government; and most importantly, (4) the structure of immigrant society. On this last point, Nash makes one of his most important contributions. Utilizing statistics gleaned from surviving wills, tax lists, rent rolls, and estate inventories, he graphically portrays the social configuration at various points in time during the first four decades of Pennsylvania history. (It is unfortunate that the statistical tables provided are unnecessarily difficult to follow.) The lack of distinct classes or great differentiation in wealth in the early period meant grave difficulties in the maintenance of a political elite as envisioned by the founder. A political order based on property, and a social order which upheld, as Penn put it, "all reasonable distinction and those civil degrees that are amongst people," could not be long maintained where such distinctions did not in fact exist.

The governmental system as provided by Penn centered power, privilege and prestige in the Council to which Penn appointed members of the monopolistic Free Society of Traders and the largest purchasers of land. Immediately, the hierarchical system provided by Penn collapsed, as disputes over land, quit-rents and the control of trade sundered the First Frame. Under the leadership of Thomas Lloyd an antiproprietary elite emerged functioning first through the Council and later dominating the Assembly as that institution assumed greater powers. The Keithian schism gave vent to yet another struggle for power ultimately resulting in the "inadvertent democratization" of Pennsylvania politics under the leadership of David Lloyd, the characterization of whom, it should be added, is as fine as anything in the book. The hegemony of the Assembly under Lloyd in the period 1701-1710 "brought Pennsylvania as close to 'middle-class democracy' . . . as it ever would be before the American Revolution."
Just why the year 1710 should be the turning point is not made altogether clear, but following that date power reverted to the newly wealthy Quaker merchants. Yet even so, "a strong tradition of dissent to prescriptive authority remained." It would appear again during the depression of the 1720's when Governor Sir William Keith, backing the popular cry for paper money, took "even more radical measures than David Lloyd had taken two decades before." Yet finally, with the return of prosperity, political calm returned and "government was left to the upper stratum."

*Quakers and Politics* clarifies much that heretofore had either been passed over or explained away as perfidy against an all-wise founder. Bringing to his task formidable powers of analysis, an awesome grasp of the most recondite sources, and a breadth of vision unclouded by the filiopietism that frequently obscures the role of William Penn, Professor Nash has given us as near definitive an account as we are likely to have.

*San Jose State College*  

THOMAS WENDT


Printers of early America deservedly attract attention. None except Franklin, it is true, rose to great fame, but as a group they exerted much influence on the life and history of the times. Among these, Isaac Collins, the Quaker printer, ranked high.

Born in Delaware, Collins went through the usual schooling to become a printer by working as an apprentice, first in Delaware and later for a short time in Virginia. On reaching twenty-one, Collins left for Philadelphia, the printing capital of America. Here he found employment with William Goddard, publisher of the *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, the most attractive newspaper in the colonies. Finally in 1770, Collins moved to Burlington, New Jersey, where he founded a printing business of his own. Soon he became printer for government documents, a coveted appointment in all the colonies. Like many another colonial press, Collins's produced an almanac which sold widely and was "a dependable money maker." Other publications included books of various kinds, especially school texts, as well as religious tracts and sermons, and essays on politics, medicine, and other topics.

In 1777 with the need in the state for a patriotic journal, Governor Livingston and the legislature persuaded Collins to accept state aid to found a newspaper. By this time Collins was recognized as one of the best printers in America, a reputation he held throughout his career.

Collins's *New Jersey Gazette* which was published until 1786, was a potent force during the war toward maintaining patriotic morale. At times, Collins, like other editors, became the target of criticism when he printed articles considered prejudicial to the best interests of the country. Collins, however (as did most editors of patriotic journals), adhered strictly to his rule of impartial news coverage. Because of their firmness and courage,
editors of the Revolutionary generation contributed measurably to the doctrine of the freedom of the press in this country.

One of Collins's later publications was the *History of the Revolution in South-Carolina* by the renowned Dr. David Ramsay. Of greater fame at the time was his excellent edition of *The Bible* (1791) which was supported by nearly all denominations although most of the volumes were purchased by members of the Society of Friends. Collins's *Bible*, however, was not unique for by 1800 more than twenty editions had been published in America.

During the Revolution, Collins was dropped from membership by the Society of Friends for supporting the war. After the war he was reinstated by acknowledging "his error in having acted inconsistently with our peaceable Testimony." Throughout his life Collins generally adhered to a strict interpretation of Quaker doctrine. Stage plays he especially disliked, but he did relent a little on the matter of personal vanity by having his portrait painted by John Wesley Jarvis.

In 1796 Collins moved with his large family to New York where he operated a press and opened a general store in charge of a son. He retired from business in 1808 and moved back to Burlington where he lived quietly until his death in 1817.

Since there are few of Collins's letters extant, Professor Hixson was unable to fully develop the personal life of his subject. Nevertheless, he has given us a useful portrait of one of our outstanding printers of the Revolutionary era.

*Rutgers University*  
*Theodore Thayer*


The classic German novel of the Thirty Years' War period is Grimmelshausen's *Simplicissimus*, first published in 1668. In it the hero gives vivid and historically accurate descriptions of those tragic years and of his own experiences and thoughts in his quest for happiness and satisfaction in this life. It is toward the end of his search that he is profoundly impressed by the exemplary way of life found among the "Hungarian Anabaptists." His accurate description of their settlement and faith, in a sense, is repeated with much more precision in the book before us, for the people who so impressed Grimmelshausen were the Hutterian Brethren. From Hungary they moved to Russia and ultimately, with the help of George Rapp's Harmony Society, to the United States, and from there to Canada and to several countries in South America.

There have been many studies of the Hutterian Brethren in recent years, so many in fact that a special bibliography on the subject has been published by Marvin P. Riley: *The Hutterite Brethren. An Annotated Bibliography with Special Reference to South Dakota Hutterite Colonies.* (Brooking, S. D., 1965.) Bennett's careful, firsthand examination is espe-
cially concerned with the agricultural economy and social organization and is based on comparatively long residence among these people and participation in their way of life. This is the reason he speaks with authority, patience and kind understanding. A number of grants to support his research enabled him to carry on additional field work in Canada and Israel and in this way to illuminate his study of the ancient Hutterian way of life by the comparatively new practices of the kibbutz. Principally, however, Bennett makes a study of six colonies of Hutterian Brethren in southwestern Saskatchewan in an area 4,700 miles square in the Great Plains section of Western Canada.

The first chapter familiarizes the reader with the region and environment of this part of Canada and the socio-economic adaptation of the Brethren to the area. In the second chapter we are given a short but excellent survey of Hutterian history and beliefs since the time of the Reformation. Considering the long history of these unusual people, this chapter seems all too short, but Bennett overcomes this objection by ample reference both in footnotes and in the bibliography to other works dealing with Hutterian history. The third chapter on the Hutterian settlement explains the interesting method of fission or splitting a settlement vertically through the generations when a settlement has grown too large for effective communal life and when a daughter colony is to be formed. We also discover that the Brethren, as a result of long years of persecution, have developed their own pattern of land acquisition, a pattern similar to that used by George Rapp in the establishment of his three settlements when he had to cope with the same problems. After explaining the relations between colonies of the Brethren, internal relations so to speak, the fourth chapter examines the Hutterian Society and the external world. The problems faced here are again quite similar to those of the Harmony Society, even before the Brethren came to America, only, it is to be noted, that the Brethren seem to handle these relations more democratically today than the Harmonists did under Rapp's more rigid and authoritarian manner. Undoubtedly this accounts in large part for the extremely low rate of defection among the Brethren.

Chapters five and six give us an inside view of kinship, family, marriage, and instrumental organization of the colonies. One sees here that their social organization is prepared to withstand the many changes of scene that have been forced upon them since Jacob Hutter was executed at Innsbruck in 1536 because of his faith. The history of Hutterite persecution equals in tragedy and tenacity that of the Jews, and, similar to the Jews, they have "a charter for social organization that travels with them," for, like the Jews, they have been driven out of most European countries, yes, even out of states and provinces of the United States and Canada. In view of this situation the durability of the Hutterian social system has constituted one of the chief interests for social studies such as the one before us.

The Hutterian economy, their labor, management and farming techniques, which Bennett carefully presents with the help of tables and graphs
in chapters seven and eight, reveal a surprising amount of method and
design within this system. This part of Bennett's study will be especially
valuable for those only familiar with the religious history of the Brethren.
Bennett finds that although the Hutterian system was planned in the
sixteenth century, it has not departed from its basic tenets. "In the
subsequent centuries, this system has had the opportunity for thoroughgoing
test and revision, although the 'miracle' of Hutterian existence is that very
little change has been necessary."

Bennett presents a carefully worked out comparison of Hutterian enter-
prise and individual enterprise in the ninth chapter, showing how the
very prosperity of a settlement can be almost as troublesome as economic
adversity. This observation would naturally be clear to all leaders of the
Brethren because all of them are versed in their history, which shows
that prosperity always was a sign of danger to the life of the settlements.
In the chapter on social differentiation and social control the comments
on "distinctive Hutterian 'psychosis,'" called by the Brethren themselves
"Anfechtung," seem to imply an unfamiliarity with the theological history
of this term. "Anfechtung" least of all would call for professional psychiatric
treatment, and if Bennett actually found that the Brethren used the help
of psychiatrists to treat "Anfechtung," then it is certain that such Hutterian
colonies will soon be dissolved—or the leaders will be changed. "Anfechtung"
in the Hutterian and Lutheran religious context belongs to the making
of a true Christian and is frequently spoken of positively in Luther's
translation of the Bible, which the Brethren use. (James I, 12: "Selig ist
der Mann, der die Anfechtung er duldet; denn nachdem er bewähret ist,
wird er die Krone des Lebens empfangen, welche Gott verheissen hat
denen, die ihn lieb haben.") In this context of Luther and Hutterian faith
the time-honored motto must be remembered: "Oratio, meditatio, tentatio
facit neminem theologum." A true Hutterian would never ask a psychiatrist to
treat him for "Anfechtung" but would follow the frequent Biblical directions
for such troubles. If Hutterians are taking such troubles to the "outside
world" they are thereby declaring the bankruptcy of their faith and their
way of life. Unfortunately, Bennett, after touching on this point says,
"But this particular issue is not our concern here."

The last chapter discusses the serious problem of a cultural conservatism
facing technological change, and in the conclusion to this chapter the author
calls the current North American phase the second Golden Age in Hutterian
history. He is very cautious about the future of the Brethren but implies
even to justify the question whether that future is not to be found in
Paraguay and Uruguay, where many have moved, in spite of the fact that
there are now 17,800 Hutterites in North America. Bennett's book con-
cludes with a very helpful bibliography and index.

_Hutterian Brethren_ is a solid contribution to Hutterite studies, and
this reader, long an admirer and student of the Hutterites, expresses his
gratitude to the author for what he has learned from this carefully prepared
and well written work.

Until the recent appearance of Jack M. Sosin's Agents and Merchants, studies of the colonial agency have focused on one colony or region and have emphasized provincial rather than London politics. Reaching divergent conclusions, both Sosin and Kammen examine the agents' role in imperial politics and the breakdown of inter-imperial communications on the eve of the revolution. Showing considerable sympathy for the king's ministers, Mr. Sosin holds that the agents injured the colonial cause in several respects and that the constitutional demands of the provincial governments made a conciliatory course increasingly difficult for Whitehall. Mr. Kammen finds merit in this position but holds that the London authorities must bear far more responsibility for soured Anglo-American relations. Unlike Sosin, he finds American influence in London declining as early as 1766.

Reflecting recent scholarship, Kammen contends that the support the colonies received after that date from English merchants, opposition politicians, and religious dissenters has been overrated. Many merchants took less interest in American affairs as they found more rewarding markets in the East. Nonconforming Protestants possessed neither the inclination nor the ability to materially assist co-religionists on this side of the Atlantic. Opponents of the ministries commonly rejected colonial constitutional arguments and could not settle upon the best way to exploit the American question.

Professor Kammen considers the disintegration of inter-imperial relations within the context of political instability in London. Shifting alignments often produced ministers who lacked knowledge to act on American affairs or the will to do anything that would endanger their precarious positions. It was ironic that

when public life was so unsettled [in the mid-1760's], the agents achieved their greatest successes. After 1769, when a degree of stability returned, lobbyists found themselves balked and their institution declining.

A partial explanation of this paradox is found in the politicians' belief that firmness toward the colonies would contribute to the establishment of a durable coalition. The emergence of the North ministry did not remove the ill effects of political instability as few expected longevity for this make-shift government. The hardening attitude toward the colonies was reflected in the seizure of agents' mail, their exclusion from parliamentary galleries, nonrecognition of their credentials, and the refusal to hear American petitions. Lobbyists were not given copies of bills affecting their interests and were forbidden to peruse Board of Trade files.

Without endorsing the charge of some agents that there existed a conspiracy to deprive Americans of liberties, the author marshals impressive
evidence to indicate that there was a policy of handling American affairs in relative secrecy. The adverse effects of conscious efforts to avoid contact with the agents were compounded by a growing penchant for proper procedure that pervaded all areas of British government. In spite of this insistence upon form, actual lines of authority were more tangled than before. The relationship between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Secretary for the Southern Department was unclear. By 1775, agents were told that inquiries were to be addressed only to the former officer. Yet Lord Dartmouth possessed less power to influence American policy than one William Eden, undersecretary at the Northern Department. Rendered ineffective, the lobbyists were unable to serve as an adhesive element—as they had in 1765-1766—until the British Empire recovered from its growing pains and a satisfactory relationship between London and the colonies was established.

Kammen's use of sources is exhaustive, and he provides a useful annotated bibliography. In places, the results of his careful research could have been presented more lucidly. Remarks on the role of British religious dissenters sometimes appear contradictory for lack of clearer language or fuller discussion. References to British radicals are fragmentary and might as well have been excluded. Readability would have been better served by a more sparing use of quotations. George III's ministers often appear through the eyes of their opponents, and a fuller view of their motives must be sought elsewhere. Nevertheless, Kammen has produced a valuable study of the colonial agency which is not likely to be superseded for some time.

Edinboro State College

DONALD C. SWIFT


It is the great virtue of our best historical novelists (of whom Walter D. Edmonds is one) that they make events and figures of the past come alive in the minds of their readers. In so doing they are not inhibited by the requirements of exactitude and documentation placed upon the historian, and they may fabricate characters, events and conversations, in keeping with their knowledge of history and the requirements of plot and characterization. Their skill may often distort history or mislead the reader into a false or erroneous interpretation. Yet they are often more successful as writers and hence influence the interpretations of history.

In turning from fiction to history, Mr. Edmonds brings his narrative and descriptive powers to bear on an era and struggle which have been immortalized by Francis Parkman. He acknowledges his debt to Parkman, John Fiske, and others; with the help of the Jesuit Relations and the published Colonial Documents of New York he rewrites much of Parkman for his readers. Whether this is necessary or advisable, he has done it well and turns in a fascinating story. Particularly attracted to the heroism of explorers, missionaries and Indian fighters, and impressed by the horrors
of Indian cruelties and frontier wars, he dwells upon these dramatic events and turns out narrative history in the grand manner. Although he does not clearly define the scope of his treatment, he includes the early settlements of the English, Dutch and Swedish colonies with evident relish for their conflicts with the Indians. No major Indian war is neglected. His readers will enjoy the retelling of the stories of La Salle, Frontenac, Marquette and Joliet, and some of the other pioneers. In dealing with more prosaic and less dramatic events he is less successful.

Although Edmonds has delved deeply, if not exhaustively (he claims no original research), he has not heeded the historical canons of balance and structure. He devotes disproportionate space to subjects which attract him or which provide conflict and drama. He allows seventeen pages for the Pequot War, but only three for the founding of Pennsylvania. He becomes so exercised over the landholding system of New York, the exploitation of the lower classes by the great landowners, that he pursues the subject far out of his period, to the Prendergast rebellion of 1766, and even to the Anti-rent Wars of the nineteenth century. Yet he ignores Pennsylvania’s difficulties over land grants, such as the “Walking Purchase,” and implies that after 1700 Iroquois-English relations were confined to New York. Thus in some instances, as in the omission of the dramatic Schenectady Massacre of 1690, he hauls up short of the eighteenth century, while in others he may go far beyond it. This is not a grievous fault, and one can always justify the pursuit of a subject beyond one’s period. But it would be helpful to the reader, or critic, if he knew what were the limits or scope of the history.

Lack of form and structure, of any clear outline based upon either chronology or geography, appear to this reviewer as the principal defect of this work. The volume is divided into four parts with no descriptive titles, but with a running list of contents, after the pattern of early novels. Part I covers New France from Champlain to Marquis de Tracy, with much attention to Indian life and customs as revealed to the Jesuits. Part II deals with English relations with the French, the Dutch settlement of New York and its history, the settlement of New England, Indian Wars, the settlement of Virginia and its history through the seventeenth century. Part III takes up the Indian wars of the Dutch again and their troubles with New England; then come New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia again, King Philip’s War, and Pennsylvania (very briefly). Part IV returns to French Canada—De Tracy’s campaign against the Iroquois, exploration of Hudson Bay, of the Mississippi by Marquette, Joliet, and La Salle, and the story of Frontenac. Here the narrative comes to an abrupt and inconclusive end. In the beginning the author refers to the momentous fall of New France in the mid-eighteenth century, with an accolade for English military skill and power, but implies that the cause of this inevitable result is to be found in this history of French, English and Indian relations. Let the reader draw his own conclusions.

Edmonds has a firm grasp of his historical material and wields it in a way every historian must envy. We may forgive him for a few blunders.
When he writes that John Winthrop "in a moment of inspiration" brought the Massachusetts Charter across the Atlantic he ignores the "Cambridge Agreement" and the careful planning made by the Puritans before the "Great Migration." Again, while giving a detailed account of "Bacon's Rebellion" in Virginia, he attributes it to "Francis" Bacon (instead of Nathaniel) and says he was aided by "another Francis Bacon, a cousin of his father's"! Yet few will read this volume for factual details or use it as a reference. It fulfills its purpose as narrative history for the general reader.

Glennmont, New York

MILTON W. HAMILTON


Within the past half decade a new breed of scholars has appeared in the historical guild. Priding themselves as scholarly spokesmen for the New Left, these historians are searching for a "useable past" for the generation of the turbulent sixties. Essentially their interpretations are neo-Beardian and their essays focus on evidences of class conflict, radicalism and exploitation of minority groups in the American experience. Challenging the consensus and continuity theme in recent American historiography, they contend that the American past is not exemplified by bland peacefulness but instead is a story of societal discord. Whether the New Left historians are the vanguard of a new cycle in American historiography, or whether they are swimming against the tide, only time will tell. Nevertheless, this is the context in which Staughton Lynd's volume must be read for it reflects the interests and interpretations of a New Left historian.

The book is a collection of ten essays that, except for two, have appeared previously in scholarly publications. The author has assembled them into three sections: "Class Conflict," "Slavery," and "The Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Historiography." Together, he hopes they provide a coherent new interpretation of the American revolutionary generation and the origins of sectional rivalry. Lynd argues that while the American Revolution "was waged by a coalition of diverse social groups, united in the desire for American independence," the war engendered a struggle between aristocratic and democratic elements within American society. Furthermore, the Constitution represented a compromise between two discordant groups, Northern capitalists and Southern plantation owners, who were jockeying for a predominant position in American government. The result was a series of compromises between them and the postponement of a second revolution that would determine "what kind of society the independent nation would become." The eventual conflict—even inevitable as Lynd's thesis logically suggests—between the two sections came in 1861, not in the aftermath of the American Revolution.

In the second section entitled "Slavery" the reader encounters the more
contemporary explorations of the author. Three essays, all published previously since 1963, reflect the New Left historians' concern with the plight of the Negro and slavery as a significant theme in American history. The initial essay, unfortunately, borders on an intemperate criticism of Frederick Jackson Turner and Charles A. Beard for their failure to appreciate the significance of slavery. Of these two historians, Lynd argues, Turner was “profoundly insensitive to the experience of one-fifth of his fellow-citizens,” and Beard whose “essential disservice” was his failure “to grasp what American slavery means for American history,” diverted the attention of historians from slavery as a developmental force in American history. Consequently, the author contends that slavery as a key factor in our national experience remains largely unexplored.

With two subsequent essays Lynd considers slavery as a core issue in the framing of the Constitution. He maintains that the origins of sectional rivalry between the free states and the slave states should be dated in 1787 and not with the Missouri Controversy of 1820. The primary effort of the Constitutional Convention was to compromise the differences and reconcile the disparate interests of the North and South. The three-fifths compromise, slave trade and fugitive slave clauses of the Constitution, he contends, were the major compromises and demonstrate that the Founding Fathers were as concerned about slavery as they were about questions of property, political power and constitutionalism.

The author is less convincing in this section of the book than in the initial essays. In striving to make history meaningful to the generation that is caught up in today’s Negro Revolution he is reading too much of the present into the past. Lynd, a mid-twentieth century advocate of Negro rights, seeks gentlemen in the Constitutional Convention who were equally concerned about the plight of the Negro. They simply were not at the Philadelphia convention in 1787.

With the third section the author carries his theme into the 1790’s. Again he argues that slavery and sectionalism divided the nation’s leadership and contributed to the political divisions that emerged during the Washington administration. The South, sensitive to the issue of federal interference with slavery, adopted the Antifederalist philosophy of state sovereignty in opposition to Hamilton’s proposals for a stronger central government. Lynd believes that historians have failed to recognize the proper reasons for political sectionalism because Jefferson misinterpreted the rationale of his Southern supporters. Jefferson attributed the political differences to economic issues. Subsequent historians like Charles A. Beard, therefore, misunderstood the real issues of the Federalist Era because they relied upon Jefferson’s assessments. The resulting effect was to exaggerate economics as a divisive factor and to minimize slavery.

Lynd has presented an intriguing and provocative book. His thesis, however, demands a more ambitious undertaking than his essays demonstrate. While his work reflects the prodigious groundwork necessary to substantiate some of his claims, frequently his scope is too limited. At other times he relies at best on circumstantial evidence. The book is
valuable nonetheless for raising new and important questions about the early republic. Hopefully, Lynd's future essays will more satisfactorily provide the answers.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

W. Wayne Smith


A celebrated controversy has persisted in recent years over the social views and political role of labor and its leadership during the Age of Jackson. This volume is an interesting contribution to the expanding literature on the subject.

The author, currently Professor of History at Staten Island Community College, has examined intensively a group of men whom he asserts “represent a balanced and representative cross section of American labor leadership during the Jackson era.” In Part One of his study he sketches the history of the Workingmen’s Party and the Trades’ Union movement. In Part Two he introduces, with appropriate biographical data, the _dramatis persona_ of the party and the movement and examines the career of each. The final section of the book, which comprises fully half of the volume, is a detailed exposition of the social thought of the leadership of both groups.

Pessen’s central contention is the uniqueness of the labor leaders, both in the party and in the movement. They rejected the optimistic assumption—common to acquisitive Jacksonians and to their patrician critics—that practically all Americans had or were in the process of getting their fair share of the community’s products.” To them, the mass of Americans lived under “appalling material conditions” which were likely to grow even worse. Nor were the sexual instincts or emotional deficiencies of the laboring poor the causes of their plight. Rather, artificial social institutions—the system of private property, the new machinery and the factory system, and monopoly (that is, the granting of corporate charters by special legislative enactments)—were the agents of mass misery.

The solution lay in the radical transformation of American institutions and the establishment of what would today be called a socialist society. Cynical with respect to the efficacy of the major parties in accomplishing this end, and hostile to Democrats and Whigs alike, they were more inclined to advocate universal public education, militant unionism and independent political action by labor as appropriate means. Pessen concludes that if a Jacksonian consensus did, indeed, exist, then labor’s leadership dissented from it. The author suggests further that these men were not only most uncommon Jacksonians, but that they were also uncommon labor leaders. Contrary to that conservatism which allegedly characterizes American labor, they preached radicalism. And despite organized labor’s aversion to separate labor-party politics, they advocated it.
Pessen has brought together a great deal of heretofore scattered information, woven it into a provocative and challenging reinterpretation, and presented it competently. His complete familiarity with the subject, his sympathy for the men whom he treats, and his strong commitment to his central thesis are evident throughout. Certain reservations, however, linger in the mind of this reviewer. Pessen carefully states the criteria upon which he selected the leaders whom he would consider. Yet certain inclusions and exclusions appear to be at variance with those criteria. While the presentation of labor’s leadership as “uncommon Jacksonians” has an appealing intellectual symmetry, it is not entirely convincing. The reader is asked, for example, to accept literally the flamboyant and bellicose rhetoric of the leaders, and to understand that their inconsistency thereafter in supporting objectives which were for the most part quite modest and typically Jacksonian, was due either to self-delusion or to fear of conservative critics. One might, however, discount their rhetoric as characteristic of that age’s penchant for overstatement and, thereby, resolve the apparent inconsistency—but the leaders would then become less uncommon. Finally, the citation form is confusing, and the liberal use of bibliographic footnotes is not an adequate alternative to a formal bibliography. *Most Uncommon Jacksonians* is a stimulating contribution to the ongoing controversy. It will not foreclose further discussion.

*Saint Francis College, Loretto, Pa.*

John F. Coleman


To students interested in the early history of the oil business, even in a general way, and to those interested in a detailed account of one man’s climb to power and influence in this industry and other ventures, Destler’s work is rewarding reading. It is also a vivid social commentary on the status structure, stratification and opportunities for advancement for the post Civil War generation in the boom towns of the oil regions of western Pennsylvania.

The biography opens in the ante-bellum South, at Randolph, Tennessee, to which the Sherman family, formerly of New York, had migrated after the failure of a land venture in Texas. Roger Sherman was related both to the distinguished signer of the Declaration of Independence and the powerful Conkling family of New York. His father’s medical practice was sufficient to establish a 1,200-acre estate, but was not enough to pay for his son’s education at Harvard. After doing survey work for the Erie Canal and the Burlington and Missouri Railway, Roger returned to the plantation to complete his legal education on the eve of the Civil War. He served in Nathan Bedford Forrest’s cavalry, but left Confederate ranks in 1863 to seek his fortune in the North. In 1865 he tried his hand as lawyer’s assistant, newspaper editor, oil prospector, correspondent, real estate agent, oil stock commissioner, investment advisor, and vigilante organizer at Pithole in western Pennsylvania. The fire at Pithole wiped
him out in 1868, so he rebuilt a better business at Pleasantville, and became associated with oil pipeline development.

While the railroads fought for business, Sherman became a financial correspondent with Dun and Bradstreet’s business reporting services. Partly because these connections recommended him for debt collections and law practice his income rose to $13,000 per annum by 1880. Sherman was generally allied with the independent producers who were opposed to the South Improvement Company and Standard Oil. A Democrat, he was concerned with newspapers and issues related to state reforms and state regulation of industry. Sherman helped plan the strategy of the Seaboard and Tidewater pipelines to defeat Standard Oil’s transportation monopoly. Despite the technical and mechanical success of these lines, Standard Oil eventually forced the Pennsylvania Railroad and these two lines into agreements with it.

As counsel for the Producers Unions, Sherman prosecuted the Commonwealth Suits against Standard Oil in 1878-1880, and gained national recognition for his exposure of rebates and pools of oil freight among four great railroad systems. Sherman forced Standard Oil to a compromise in February, 1880, in which rebates and discrimination were renounced by both sides, the suits against Standard were dropped, and Standard agreed to pay the legal costs of the Producers Unions up to that point. Sherman’s fee for this accomplishment was surprisingly small, only $5,000, but his talents were better recognized by his opponent, Rockefeller, than by his friends. As a consequence he took a salaried position on the staff of S. C. T. Dodd, general solicitor for the Standard Oil Trust in early 1882. Sherman, of course, had a perfect moral and legal right to work for whom he chose, but had to defend himself against attacks on his personal integrity. Interestingly, the legal papers and letters generated during this period were returned by Sherman to Dodd in 1887, and, eighty years later, the author of this study was refused permission by the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey to examine these archives! Sherman resumed private law practice in March, 1887 and, already an editor of the Democratic American Citizen, could enjoy politics as a molder of opinion and as critic of boism and the Associated Press.

In the chapter entitled “Joining the Civic Elite,” the author gives us a detailed account of Sherman’s efforts to provide culture and foster the social amenities in Titusville. First there was the establishment of a library. Sherman sold membership tickets at $2 each, encouraged the gift of these tickets to the less fortunate, kept the minutes of the directors meetings, held a benefit “musical” in his home, and ordered most of the books and periodicals. He served as a member of the Civil Service Reform Association; he was on the Resolutions Committee of the Democratic State Convention in 1881; in 1882 he was president of the Young Men’s Democratic Club of Titusville; and in 1884 he was almost elected mayor of the normally Republican town. He was denied nomination to the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1887. This disappointed him, especially since it was alleged that his recent tie with Standard Oil was the reason for
the rejection. He supported the Americanization program of the Sons of the American Revolution, and was elected vice-president of the Pennsylvania branch of this organization. In 1886 he contributed $500 to the Opera House and continued to support its concerts. He was elected chairman of the Voluntary Relief Association after fire and flood had destroyed much of industrial Titusville in 1892. Possibly Sherman’s most lasting contribution to students of American history is the legal aid, editorial advice and information he supplied in 1893 for Henry Demarest Lloyd’s Wealth Against Commonwealth.

Near the close of his career Sherman represented the United States Pipe Line Company, the Producers Oil Company and the Producers and Refiners Oil Company. These were attempts to find an opening through or a flank around the Standard Oil monopoly. None was immediately successful because of the frequent depressions in the oil industry, the “squeeze” between high crude prices and low refined prices, the Standard practice of secretly buying into the independent associations and trusts, the lack of adequate overseas markets, and the indifference or hostility of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey legislatures. For example, while armed guards of the Lackawanna Railroad fought with those of the United States Pipe Line Company in New Jersey, Sherman tried to obtain from the legislature an act like the free-pipeline law of Pennsylvania. He was not successful in this, but did acquire a farm which had a right of easement via a culvert under the Lackawanna tracks. The Pure Oil Company was organized by Sherman in 1895 to buy from the independents and sell directly to the dealers.

In the last few months before his death in New York in September, 1897, Sherman prepared the evidence of a criminal antitrust suit against the Standard Oil executives. His untimely death delayed for some years, until 1911, effective action against Standard Oil Company.

West Chester State College

DONN RILEY


The author sets some ambitious goals for himself in this book. He proposes to contribute to the revision of the viewpoints of Charles A. and Mary R. Beard and of Howard K. Beale, who concluded that the Radical Republicans of the Reconstruction Era used the questions of guaranteeing integrity of the Union and Negro rights as “smoke screens” to hide the efforts “of the Northeastern business community to secure its hegemony in the federal government against the threat of a hostile coalition of Southern and Western agrarian interests.” Simultaneously, he aims at a revision of the analysis of the labor movement during the same period made by John R. Commons, Selig Perlman, and Gerald N. Grob, who bifurcated “labor leaders into wage-conscious trade unionists and anti-monopoly reformers,” and thereby “obscured the ideological affinity between the then-prominent trade unionists and the Radicals and the great strides
made by wage earners between 1862 and 1875 in creating effective bar-
gaining and lobbying institutions."

More positively, he undertakes a partial reinterpretation of the period
through an identification and analysis "of the various Northern groups
participating in the Reconstruction debate by examining their responses"—
not to the great national issues—but "to issues which arose in their home
communities." And the issues with which he is primarily concerned are
those raised by trade unionists who demanded that "social reconstruction
be extended northward." To a remarkable degree he succeeds in his purpose.

His reinterpretation begins with an outline of the problems of the newer
post-bellum entrepreneurs in manufacturing who were looking for means
to expand, and for the workingmen who were looking for means to lift
themselves out of the wage-earner status. He then identifies and analyzes
the political groupings of 1865-1866: old-line Democrats, Conservatives, and
Radicals—a perceptive analysis but, ironically, with some Beardian over-
tones. He defines the Radicals as enthusiastic supporters of nationalism,
egalitarianism, and the utilitarianism represented by the new elite of manu-
facturers. They believed in using the power of the state, within or without
the Constitution, for the good of all the people.

He next analyzes the structures, operations, attitudes, and aspirations
of workingmen between 1862 and 1868—the finest account of the labor
movement during the period I have ever seen—and their gradual attrac-
tion to reform and to the Radicals and their reform ideology. The climax
of this development was the creation of the National Labor Union, which,
he contends, was not created as a trade union congress, but was formed
by trade unionists as the political arm of a labor reform movement, which,
in short, intended to use the state to aid the wage earner in his own pursuits
of an "open society" and consequent self improvement.

Trade union leaders—all politically conscious—turned naturally to the
Radicals for assistance. The original major issue was the eight-hour day,
which would give the workingman the time he needed to improve himself.
Professor Montgomery's chapter on the meaning of the eight-hour day to
workingmen and of Ira Steward's philosophy is extraordinarily competent.

The result was almost predictable. The Radicals, in the face of strong
employer opposition, were unable or unwilling to secure the kind of
state and Federal eight-hour legislation that would satisfy workingmen and
thereby alienated labor; at the same time they were blamed for the
industrial turmoil that the eight-hour movement precipitated—"dangerous
to society"—and alienated businessmen. The ideological foundations of
radicalism crumbled; among both workingmen and manufacturers there
arose "an attitude of contempt or hostility toward the state itself."

At this point (1868) a new group of leaders emerged in the Republican
Party. They soon divided into Stalwarts, who were interested in keeping
their party in office and willing to offer "concessions to any social group
that represented a significant body of votes," and Liberals, who, like
Edward L. Godkin, argued that "the government must get out of the
'protective' business and the 'subsidy' business and the 'improvement' and
developed' business." Such business had to be left to private initiative. Labor reformers, who might have moved toward a revolutionary class struggle, instead turned their attention to an old Radical program—the Greenbackism of Edward Kellogg and Alexander Campbell. They received aid only from remnants of the old Radicals, the "Sentimental Reformers," who now pushed the National Labor Union into independent political action.

I have some reservations about the totality of Mr. Montgomery's revisionist interpretation. I am not sure that the "open society" ideology was the exclusive property of the Radicals. Although I don't belong to the John R. Commons school, I believe there is ample evidence of a dichotomy in the labor world. It showed up clearly in the 1840's and still exists today. Nevertheless, Professor Montgomery's shift of focus makes his work impressive. Beyond Equality should become a landmark in the historiography of the Reconstruction Era.

Temple University

JOSEPH G. RAYBACK

THE RADICAL REPUBLICANS: AN ESSAY REVIEW

By WILLIAM G. SHADE


Historians' contrasting views of the radical Republicans have often served as the touchstone of their differing interpretations of Reconstruction. Early in this century, historians exalting national unity and white superiority pictured the radicals as vindictive fanatics who plundered the South and trampled under foot national interest, the Constitution, and the "natural order." To a later generation influenced by Charles Beard's view of American history and the economic crisis of the thirties, the radicals were Republican corruptionists who masked their strivings for political power and economic domination behind hypocritical "claptrap" about justice for the black man. More recently contemporary racial problems have spurred new interest in the radicals and spawned a more sympathetic view of their program and motives.

In Judicial Power and Reconstruction Politics, Stanley I. Kutler argues that the traditional understanding of the radical Republicans' relations with the Supreme Court and the role of the Court in Reconstruction is seriously defective. Rather than a weakened, intimidated, do-nothing institution, the Chase Court expanded its power and exhibited a generally activist pose. "The fifteen years following the outbreak of the Civil War... witnessed
the greatest legislative expansion of jurisdiction since 1789" and represent
the beginning of "modern American legal history."

The traditional interpretation rests on what, according to Kutler, is
an inaccurate view of Republican attitudes toward the Court. Although
Republicans vigorously criticized the Court following the Dred Scott
decision, the majority of the party wished to alter the Court's makeup
rather than to destroy it. The various Republican reorganization plans,
while being political in the sense that they reduced Southern influence,
"amounted to creative reform, reflecting a practical regard for the Court's
potentiality as a power phenomenon." The redrawing of circuits in 1862
made them more nearly equal in size and reformed the system that
existed before the war. The later reduction of the number of circuits and
justices was done with the compliance of President Andrew Johnson and
the justices themselves, and was again accompanied by constructive reform
of the lower courts of appeal. "The temporary withdrawal of jurisdiction
in the McCardle case stands as the only exception" to this pattern of con-
structive reform and it must be seen, "within the context of the terrible
pressures operating upon the Republican party."

In dealing with the Court itself, Kutler argues that "the usual assump-
tion . . . that the Court opposed the congressional program and could
have ended the whole sordid business if it had not been so wary of reprisal
is tenuous and the evidence points to the contrary." Much of the Court's
cautions on Reconstruction matters derived from a close division within
the Court itself. On other issues the Court was less hesitant. "In fact
the Supreme Court neither cringed at threats from vindictive congress-
men nor abdicated its traditional functions. Indeed, the Court steadily
expanded its power through an increased use of the judicial veto and
through its role as arbiter between federal and state power."

There can be no doubt that this small book will be controversial,
because of the vigor with which it is argued. Often the force and confidence
of the author's arguments carry the reader over areas where the evidence
is extremely thin; and his contention that the Chase Court did not serve
the cause of states rights is unconvincing. Yet Kutler's analysis of judicial
reform, his reading of Ex Parte Milligan and Ex Parte Yerger, and his
discussion of the expansion of the Court's functions are superb.

Implicit in Kutler's study is the view of the radical Republicans as
pragmatic politicians trying to implement a scheme for the protection of
the freedmen's civil rights in the face of presidential and Democratic
obstructionism. Hans L. Trefousse has taken a major part in the creation
of this new view of the radicals in several articles and in his biographies
of two of the most ultra "vindictives," Benjamin F. Butler and Benjamin
F. Wade. In The Radical Republicans he attempts a comprehensive ex-
amination of this group to determine "Who the radicals were, what qualities
they had in common, how they differed from one another, and what kind
of motives impelled them . . . and . . . why they disappeared from the
stage so quickly, and completely after their triumphs."
Trefousse's answers to these questions can be easily summarized. He generally argues that the radicals were a disparate group held together only by "a common attitude toward problems connected with slavery." While many were interested in some variety of reform as well as racial justice, the radicals were not "extremists," but attempted to achieve their ends through constitutional means. Like many other recent scholars, Trefousse minimizes the differences between the radicals and Lincoln, and defends the radicals' Reconstruction program. He argues that they broke with Johnson only after "they exhausted every means of coming to an agreement." Their motives were a combination of humanitarianism and political realism. "They were seeking . . . neither vengeance nor crass political gain; they wanted security for their experiment in modern democracy." Only southern refusal to comply with the Fourteenth Amendment caused the continuation of congressional Reconstruction; and at this point the radicals moved ahead although this endangered their political position.

Trefousse's explanation of the decline of the radicals is eclectic, combining northern racism, resistance from the Supreme Court, Republican factionalism, disorder in the South, and the departure and death of the radical leadership as factors, but he tends to emphasize the effects of the impeachment of Johnson which he considers a major blunder.

The Radical Republicans is exciting narrative history, well written and based on extensive manuscript research, and its most important points are well taken, but the book falters in several ways. One of the book's problems is methodological. Many crucial questions about the radicals remain unanswered because of Trefousse's refusal to examine systematically the radicals and their opponents. Thus both the social origins of radicalism and the dynamics of the movement are unclear. Without more precise description of who the radicals were, analysis of their motives remains speculation. A second more obvious problem is related to the first. Trefousse manipulates his categories and characters too facilely in order to portray the radicals as modern, secular liberals who were neither "extremists" nor tainted by nativist "bigotry." The ambiguity of radical attitudes on ethnic matters, religion and race are glossed over. For example, Trefousse merely ignores the racist attitudes of most Free Soilers and the use many Republicans, including the radical Zachariah Chandler, made of negrophobia.

Certainly Trefousse is to be applauded for making the radicals a serious subject for study and for reminding us of their struggle a century ago for a more just racial order. But if we are really to understand them, we must study the radicals in a more detailed and systematic fashion without fear that by acknowledging their ambiguities and human frailties we are denying the righteousness of their goals.

Two rather narrowly focused studies, Richard Current's, Three Carpetbag Governors, and William S. McFeely's, Yankee Stepfather, reveal the new direction in which the study of the Republicans during Reconstruction is moving.
Along with Current's earlier essay, "Carpetbaggers Reconsidered," the three lectures in his small book offer a beginning for a complete re-evaluation of this significant element of the Republican party in the South. Current has convincingly argued that the stereotype of the poor Yankee who tried to make his fortune in the South by using public office corruptly and manipulating Negro votes does not fit even a small minority of the northern-born Republicans who held office in the southern states during the Reconstruction years. Rather, these men were generally Union army veterans who came south to seek their fortunes much as many other Americans had gone west. They often brought large amounts of capital and generally intended to settle and join into the business of the South. A variety of motives, including the desire for financial gain, pushed them into politics, but there is little evidence to show that they were any less honest or less capable than the average politicians of their day. Democrats and Conservatives violently hated them, because they "upset the pattern of race relationships, the pattern of Negro passivity, which most white Southerners considered ideal."

In this brief series of lectures Current attempts to develop his views through the intensive examination of three men: Harrison Reed of Florida, Henry Clay Warmoth of Louisiana, and Adelbert Ames of Mississippi. The author's purpose is to show, that, as a group, the Carpetbaggers were characterized by diversity of motives and actions. Reed was a Whiggish conservative who gained political power through his support of Andrew Johnson. Always more "interested in promoting economic development rather than Negro rights," be made few attempts to work with the freedmen. Warmoth, who was a radical and aligned with blacks, may have been a "corruptionist"; but "it would be nearer the truth to say that Louisiana corrupted him than to say that he corrupted Louisiana." His downfall was a product of factional bickering within his own ranks rather than an outraged response to his "dictatorship." Ames was a tragic figure, "about as pure and incorruptible a governor as Mississippi or any state is likely ever to have." Hardworking, honest, and egalitarian, he was undermined by racist terror tactics at home and vacillation in Washington.

Diverse as these three men were, none fits the stereotype, and taken together they render it useless. They cannot be characterized as corruptionists. Their relations with blacks were neither demagogical nor wholly idealistic. Federal patronage was not always forthcoming; and the dictator image ignores the fact that they were "handicapped if not hamstrung by carpetbag-scalawag-Negro rivalries within the Republican Party and by the Ku Klux terrorism of the Democrats."

These themes of diversity, ambiguity, and racial bitterness are further developed in McFeely's book, Yankee Stepfather: General O. O. Howard and the Freedmen, which is neither a study of the workings of the Freedmen's Bureau nor a biography of Howard, but rather an artful analysis

of the way in which the Bureau and its commissioner responded to the aspirations of the freedmen. It is clearly the study of failure.

Through a detailed re-examination of the questions of the distribution of land and the contract system, McFeely revises the traditional view which presents the Bureau as an instrument of radical policy. Rather than securing "too much for the Negro too soon," as George Bentley has argued, the Bureau failed the freedmen and yielded them up to the domination of their former masters. Howard too often naively accepted the promises of the white southerners and overestimated the good intentions of the President. As a leader he too often acquiesced in the dismissal of radical personnel on specious charges and caved in too easily on the land issue.

At the same time Howard was overly willing to view the contract system as beneficial to the freedmen without perceiving the problems it caused. "Howard had the power to change the freedmen's position in the nation" and failed to do it. Rather than opposing Johnson, the Bureau was subverted to the President's purposes and, in the long run, "served to preclude rather than promote Negro freedom."

McFeely's argument is subtle and sensitive to the tragic strains within the radical Republican ideology. His basic thesis concerning the conservatism of Bureau policy is well constructed and convincing, but he seems to overstate his case and is overly harsh in his judgment of Howard. McFeely shows an unwarranted disdain for religious reformers based on a superficial understanding of ante-bellum religion. As a consequence, his distinction between Rufus Saxton's secularism and Howard's religiously inspired moralism is over-drawn. McFeely also speculates too freely on limited psychological evidence to build his interpretation of Howard. At the same time he overestimates Howard's power to bring about basic change and underestimates his political vulnerability by stressing what should have been in terms of justice to the freedmen without recognizing the power relationships and complex institutional and administrative problems faced by Howard. (Here a comparative study of the Freedmen's Bureau and some twentieth century agency might be quite rewarding.)

In all, however, the book's strengths far outweigh its weaknesses. McFeely has rightly gone beyond the simple legal structures which continue to be the subject of most histories and has attempted to deal with the implementation and functioning of Reconstruction policies. This, along with his perceptive discussion of the complex internal contradictions in radical attitudes represents a major step toward a fuller understanding of radical Reconstruction.

The radicals will continue to be a subject of interest and, because of their central importance to the drama of Reconstruction, will continue to serve as a key to prevailing attitudes toward the period. McFeely's book indicates the emergence of a new critical stance toward the radicals as part of a society whose ideological underpinnings made the establishment of a just racial order following the Civil War nearly impossible. While such a focus on values and attitudes is necessary to the full understanding
of any historical movement, let us hope that these scholars do not fall prey to an ideological determinism as rigid and unyielding as the economic determinism of the Beardians. Only when we consider the entire sum of forces encompassed by the ideological-institutional matrix within which the radicals operated will we be able to understand their striving for success and their ultimate failure.
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