BOOK REVIEWS

EDITED BY NORMAN B. WILKINSON


This volume, among the many which will be published in anticipation of the bicentennial celebration, is intended to provide a biography "in his own words" of Benjamin Franklin. Others of the Founding Fathers will be given similar treatment in this series, hopefully with better results.

The general format is to utilize the extant writings of the subject and produce a biography relying upon a minimum of explanatory or transitional material furnished by the editor. In the case of Franklin heavy reliance is placed upon his Autobiography, one of the best in the English language, but one which was not begun until Franklin was sixty-five and which takes him only through age fifty. The material for the extensive later years of his life was furnished by the editor, having been granted access to the mass of Franklin papers which are in the process of being published by Yale University Press. Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., of the American Philosophical Society furnishes an excellent introduction, outlining the vicissitudes of collecting Franklin's papers. This fine essay becomes the scholarly highpoint of the volume.

As would be expected in a book which appears aimed at the popular rather than the scholarly reader, the familiar vignettes of Franklin's life are emphasized and handled well by the editor. Young Franklin's distaste for his father's trade of tallow chandling, his father's desire to see his articulate son enter the ministry, and Ben's "strong inclination for the Sea" resulted, however, in his being apprenticed to his printer brother, the publisher of The New England Courant. Frustrated writers could well be envious of Franklin's success in being established as a regular columnist at age sixteen under the pseudonym of Silas Dogood. The young printer apprentice appreciated that writing would be "the principal means of my advancement." Franklin was to enjoy greater success with Richard Saunders, better known to history as Poor Richard, and his sage advice over the twenty years that the Almanack was published.

Well on his way to becoming a self-made man, Franklin showed the disdain of the working class for Harvard in particular and for college education in general. College students, according to Franklin, returned from their "Temples of Learning" after an "Abundance of Trouble and Charge, as great Blockheads as ever, only more proud and self-conceited." The question of whether James Franklin could remain both brother and master in the apprentice system of the eighteenth century was resolved after some harsh treatment of Ben and the younger Franklin's removal to Philadelphia. Franklin's versatility seems the main theme of the book; and probably no
other American personality pursued as many interests as Franklin the
printer, demographer, electrician, scientist, meteorologist, bibliophile,
philosopher, politician, lobbyist, diplomat, postmaster, insurance agent, and
economist. The editor furnishes sufficient information about Franklin's
other interests to include philanderer in the above list. The sexual peccadilloes of our past leaders seem to be a subject in vogue these days.

The methodology of the editor, however commendable, in relying upon
Franklin's words and limiting his own editorial comments, seriously restricts
the objectivity of the volume. Using only Franklin's and the editor's ac-
counts of the Stamp Act crisis ignores the painstaking scholarship and strik-
ingly different interpretations of such recent students as Edmund Morgan
and Lawrence Gipson. The editor endows his subject with prescience and
portrays Franklin in 1765 as the indignant Pennsylvania agent in London
upholding American interests against British oppression. Although not to be
found in the book, the serious student of the period knows that in that same
year Franklin was asserting that American fears for their liberties were
"bugbears" and that concern by the colonists for standing armies of redcoats
and stricter British controls were "falsehoods raised to terrify us." Surely we
are sufficiently mature today to concede Franklin's ambivalence toward the
coming British-American conflict.

It may be laudatory of the editor to insist that if Grenville had taken
Franklin's advice in 1764 and adopted a system of paper currency under
parliamentary regulation the "American Revolution might never have taken
place," but such speculation is not to be confused with sound scholarship.
This book gives neither a clear nor a balanced account of Franklin's quarrel
with the Pennsylvania proprietors, and the student must consult William S.
Hanna and others for meaningful treatments of Franklin and Pennsylvania
politics.

A major problem of the volume is the welding of many diverse topics into
a coherent narrative. Chapter Six, for example, deals with information on
Franklin's quarrels with the Penns, Franklin's medical problems and their
treatment, his genealogical travels in Britain, his knowledge of the Bible, the
argument for the restoration of Canada to the French after the French and
Indian War, the readability of the type used by certain British printers, Deb-
orah Franklin's aversion to ocean travel, the operating principles of
barometers, the intricacies and tonal difficulties of playing the armonica,
and Franklin's success in obtaining for his son William the governorship of
New Jersey. The uniting of so many different subjects is a \textit{tour de force}
which would tax the most talented editor, and some readers may not be
pleased with the result.

The coverage of the later years is handicapped by the editor having to rely
entirely on his subject's correspondence, with the result that his many years
abroad and involvement in the critical diplomacy of the Treaty of Paris are
treated in a manner wherein Franklin, the versatile, lovable, and talented
American, is emphasized at the expense of a balanced historical treatment of
Franklin the diplomat. The book lacks the usual scholarly apparatus, and
the editor rarely concedes, particularly in dealing with political or diplo-
matic topics, that there is another point of view.
As the Cassandras of 1973 lament the prospects of this nation surviving Vietnam, Watergate, and the energy crisis, others will be encouraged by Franklin’s hopes for America’s future expressed in a 1780 letter to George Washington from Paris:

I must soon quit this Scene, but you may live to see our Country flourish, as it will amazingly and rapidly after the War is over. Like a Field of young Indian Corn, which long Fair weather and Sunshine has enfeebled and discolored, and which in that weak State... seem’d to be threaten’d with absolute Destruction; yet the Storm being past, it recovers fresh Verdure, shoots up with double Vigour, and delights the Eye, not of its Owner only, but of every observing Traveller.

The volume does succeed in creating a biography "in his own words" of Franklin chronicling his long life, selecting many interesting vignettes which emphasize his versatility, patriotism, and success. The book is handsomely illustrated and will grace many coffee tables. The scholar will be disappointed with the lack of balance and objectivity.

*United States Naval Academy*  
JOHN W. HUSTON


When Dr. Bining’s work was published in 1938, he sought "to present in some detail an account of the origin and progress of the Pennsylvania iron industry during its first century of development, especially its social and economic aspects." He was eminently successful in that effort. Reviewers acclaimed his book as "a model for research, organization, and presentation of economic history" (Carl Bridenbaugh), congratulated the author for his "thorough and painstaking research" (Lester Cappon), and commented on the "magnificent footnotes and invaluable bibliography" (Leland D. Baldwin). Writers of textbooks on our Commonwealth’s history have similarly acknowledged their debt of gratitude to Dr. Bining.

The book has been out-of-print for some time, and there has been a continuing demand on the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission to republish it. This second edition, in which some minor changes in text, footnotes, bibliography, and illustrations have been made, remains the book that Dr. Bining wrote. Although the author had projected a companion volume on the manufacture of iron in nineteenth-century Pennsylvania, a task which he did not complete, this book capably stands on its own.

Bining’s time span is the period from 1716, when Thomas Rutter built a bloomery forge in the Manatawny region, to 1800, when Pennsylvania had clearly demonstrated its leadership in the production of iron. His thesis is that the technique and form of iron enterprises elsewhere in the colonies were virtually the same as those of Pennsylvania. Hence, the study of the
The iron industry here provides an appropriate model for an understanding of colonial iron developments.

The early ironmasters, men of British, Welsh, German, Scotch, Irish, and French origins, were drawn from all levels of society, the landed aristocracy, the merchant class, and the lower class. Some had been or ultimately became civic and political leaders (John Dickinson, Joseph Galloway, James Wilson), judges (John and Samuel Potts), and commissioned military officers (Daniel Udree, George Ross, Mark Bird). All faced the same challenges—inadequate supplies of capital, the lack of skilled workmen, and the high cost of transportation. With funds drawn from their agricultural, commercial, and business pursuits and sometimes from marriage, they located their operations near promising supplies of iron ore, abundant stands of timber for charcoal, rapidly-descending streams for power, and the best available means of transportation. On almost self-sufficient plantations of several thousand acres, each constructed a furnace, forges, a store, a gristmill, a sawmill, and houses for themselves and their workers. Few of the ironmasters or their employees were acquainted with the chemical properties of iron and steel and still fewer had studied metallurgical chemistry, yet the technique and processes at the furnace and forges became fairly standardized. Bining concisely and lucidly describes the steps in char-ring wood, filling and operating the furnace, and using refining forges and stamping, rolling, and slitting mills.

Laborers, scarce in their number and expensive to hire, were, like their masters, a heterogeneous group. Some were free men, others were redemptioners or indentured servants. Some were black, free and slave, and there was an occasional Indian. The skilled workers at both furnaces and forges were usually English, Welsh, Irish, and German “although quite often free Negroes and Negro slaves filled such positions at the forges.” Indentured servants and redemptioners, mostly from Great Britain and Germany (but again some blacks and mulattoes) were the common laborers. Bining seems to have a high regard for the black men but a low opinion of the Indians for they “never could be depended upon.” Women had little or no part in the production of iron while children were not employed except to make iron wire cards for combing fibers, but this only at the end of the century. When the furnace was in blast, a twelve-hour working day was normal. Wages rose slightly during the century primarily because of rising consumer prices. Scrip and the truck system were used without evident abuse, class lines were not rigidly fixed, and the conditions of labor and living were markedly better than those of ironworkers in England. Indeed, Bining believes that the ironmasters “had much sympathy for their workmen and treated them well.”

The book’s shortcomings are minor ones. A map of the colony with the furnaces and forges located would have been helpful. Bining’s treatment of the Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary periods is rather thin, and his limited coverage of developments in western Pennsylvania results in a somewhat unbalanced effect. Yet the general reader and the current student of history interested in topics relating to Pennsylvania, industry, labor, economics, and technology in the eighteenth century will find this work indis-
pensable, even after a third of a century.

West Chester State College  ROBERT E. CARLSON


Among historians of early America there has long been a general indifference toward recording the development of colonial New Jersey. For most scholars the early annals of the lands between the Delaware and Hudson rivers have appeared unexceptional compared with its larger neighbors. Nevertheless, the common historical traditions and experiences which New Jersey shared with many of the larger thirteen original states does in fact form an important aspect of its colonial past. And, as Professor Pomfret shows in his study of colonial New Jersey, this "garden of North America" also displayed certain examples of uniqueness during its formative years.

Pomfret's history of colonial New Jersey can be divided into three distinct time periods; the founding and proprietary era to 1702; the years of royal governmental control prior to 1763; and finally, a climactic period extending through the American Revolution. It was during the initial period that the Duke of York established English control over the sparsely settled lands between the Delaware and Hudson and somewhat simultaneously in 1664 made a proprietary grant of these fertile lands to two friends, Sir George Cartaret and John Lord Berkeley. The region, named for Cartaret's Jersey Island home, was to be administered by these noblemen, but, despite their liberal overtures to settlers, the proprietors' aspirations of reaping substantial profits from their New World holdings proved ephemeral. Pomfret notes that, like similarly governed colonies, there were complaints against proprietary control and demands for personal rights almost from the outset of English rule. Lord Berkeley sold his holdings to a Quaker speculator prior to the formal division of the colony into eastern and western portions in 1676, and six years later the disappointed Cartaret heirs auctioned off their eastern portion to a dozen Quakers. The rule of these new proprietors also proved tenuous. Although the Glorious Revolution and subsequent collapse of the Dominion of New England gained a temporary respite for these resident proprietors, the movement toward imperial centralization was renewed with the creation of the Board of Trade in 1696. Aided by discontent and disorders within the colony, the board, in "its single victory," finally forced the surrender of the anachronistic proprietorships in 1702.

During the ensuing period prior to 1763, the author notes several occurrences in New Jersey which were similar to other royal colonies. The emergent success of a representative assembly over royal governors and royal prerogative, the contentions over currency issues, taxes, and judicial tenure, and the development of largely autonomous local governmental institutions were experiences which New Jersey shared with other crown colonies. Similarly, problems over land titles and boundaries were experienced by most other royal colonies. Its uniqueness in administration resulted from the fact that during the period 1702-1738 New Jersey shared its governorship with New York and had three capitals, including New York.
City. Links with both New York and Pennsylvania were most closely forged during this era in social, economic, religious, and intellectual spheres. Yet despite these important ties with its larger neighbors, the author points out that New Jersey still has had its own distinguishing features. It was more middle class and less socially stratified; it contained a comparatively greater extent of religious pluralism; and in education, the founding of two pre-Revolutionary colleges (Princeton and Rutgers) put it “one-up” on its Empire and Keystone neighbors.

The Revolutionary period was as climactic for New Jersey as for the other continental colonies. Pomfret contends, however, that unlike these other colonies, “the spirit of independence, much less revolution did not spring up simultaneously” and was more “unexpected” than “inevitable.” In this respect he cites the general contentment of the colony, the lack of extreme radicalism—even among its patriots, and the fact that the colony’s last royal governor, Thomas Franklin, received the general respect of the people. Two factors nevertheless are cited for bringing the colony into the mainstream of the revolutionary movement by 1775; the desire to act together with its New York and Pennsylvania neighbors, and the personalities and philosophical beliefs of the leaders of the colonial assembly. There were, of course, dissident Quaker and loyalist elements within the colony, and some of the bitterest battles of the Revolution were fought on its soil. Yet the author concludes that once the colony had cast its lot with the patriot cause, it remained dedicated to its precepts throughout the ensuing conflict.

Professor Pomfret has achieved an admirable success in surveying the many features, personalities, and institutions which figured in the founding and early development of this “garden of North America.” His work is very well-written and organized. The book offers an extensive and informative bibliography and also includes an appendix chronologically listing “the Chief Proprietors, the Proprietary Governors, and the Royal Governors of New Jersey, 1664-1776.” There are, however, several minor historical flaws within the text. For example, William Cosby was formerly governor of Minorca not Malta before he received the New York-New Jersey post, and neither Samuel Davies nor Samuel Finley (Princeton College presidents) were Yale graduates. Also, the Puritan “Half-Way Covenant” was adopted in 1662 not 1682, and Sir William Howe forced the surrender not the “evacuation” of Fort Washington on Manhattan Island in 1776. Such errors, nevertheless, are quite minor in an over-all assessment of this fine and valuable work. It is my hope that the other twelve volumes in this series devoted to individual histories of the American colonies will match the standards of this work.

Loyola University of Chicago

Sheldon S. Cohen


It is Professor Main’s thesis that the American Revolution opened the gates for a broad advance in the development of American democracy. British rule, he states, “prevented the agrarian-localists from exerting the
weight appropriate to their numbers." But during the war the new state constitutions "democratized the distribution of power," and politics no longer became "the exclusive prerogative of the Whig Leaders." Instead politics "gradually became the instrument of a popular majority." Most of the men who began the Revolution did not favor government by the people, but they found it impossible to reverse the trend. This summation brings Main back to Carl Becker's thesis that the Revolution was a dual struggle, one for independence and the other to determine who would rule at home.

For background the first three chapters survey society and making a living in colonial America. On the frontier and areas of small farms, society had become equalitarian or nearly so. In the cities and areas of commercial farming, however, the gap between rich and poor was widening. "Thus independence," Main states, "meant to some men abundance for all, to other men riches only for the successful." "The resolution of this conflict over social goals," he writes, "depended partly upon the situation of power and partly upon economic realities in the new nation."

In a chapter of politics, Main emphasizes that as Tory ideology was phased out during the Revolution, democratic concepts took its place against the Whigs who favored republican principles of government. Democratic beliefs, according to Main, stemmed from radical Protestantism, left wing Whiggism, and the enlightenment. Democracy appealed to the interest of the common man and deference to the rich and well-born declined as the farmers and artisans gained in importance and recognition during the long war.

For the new state constitutions, Main emphasizes two opposing points of view: that of the Whigs and that of those who favored a more democratic structure. In Pennsylvania, Georgia, and Vermont the latter won out while the Whig ideology in one degree or another prevailed in the other states. However, even in these there were elements of the new democratic thrust. After 1776 the democratic urge subsided due to the need of stronger government during the war. But the Revolution, states Main, "liberated the democratic impulse from its colonial shackles; but full realization lay far in the future."

In promoting the leveling drift of American society, Main points out that the taking over of the crown lands and the proprietary holdings in Pennsylvania and Maryland contributed much more than the confiscation of private estates. After the war thousands of men found opportunity for advancement opened by the new lands beyond the borders of the old frontier. Thus "The Revolution," Main states, "contributed to the decline of deference, increased mobility, delayed the trend toward an economic and social autocracy, and momentarily reversed the growing concentration of wealth."

Main surveys for the period of the war and after differences over the severity of anti-loyalist legislation, the structure of militia laws, impressment of supplies and other questions relative to his thesis. As the war progressed, a more significant and constant alignment emerged over these issues, especially the economic ones. Meanwhile the Whigs began to back political and economic nationalism which caused them to regain power in some states. During the post-war years, however, the democratic forces in Rhode Island,
New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Georgia gained control of their governments and passed measures for relieving debtors. In Massachusetts the unrest exploded in Shay’s Rebellion.

In his *American States During and After the Revolution*, published fifty years ago, Allan Nevins also portrayed the rise of the democratic interest in America. Nevins, unlike Main, deprecated the democratic aspirations of the common man. Pennsylvania adopted a very radical constitution. But Nevins wrote, “in the country as a whole that did not happen; the clash of conservative Whigs and extremist Whigs occurred in thirteen different stages.... the extremists were in general deprived of the support to be had in linking their dubious schemes of internal change....” More closely than Nevins, Main follows internal developments and supports his findings with countless facts gathered from recent writings as well as from his own investigations.

Students of history may lament the lack of footnotes, although a fairly lengthy bibliography is supplied. In general Main’s thesis is the one preferred by this reviewer. Historians, however, who adhere to “consensus” interpretations popular a few years ago may find it unacceptable.

*Captives’ Mansion: An American Family Chronicle Covering Nine Generations and 200 Years in a Pennsylvania Rural Manor.* By S. R. Slaymaker


During the past several years American social historians have expressed a growing interest in the history of families and local institutions. Through an investigation of individual communities and everyday family life they have begun to re-examine the problem of historical change, growth, and development—testing old generalizations and forming new ones. To date most of these efforts have been confined largely to colonial New England, where local traditions are deeply imbedded and records most complete. Yet even here many problems persistently nag the researcher: incomplete data, undue reliance on the most articulate class in the community, and genealogies prepared by persons seeking famous ancestors rather than historical accuracy. *Captives’ Mansion* marks a welcome change and illustrates the historical and personal rewards of genealogical exploration.

Refreshingly skeptical about his ancestors’ lineage, politics, and frailties, S. R. Slaymaker has unveiled a remarkable historical and architectural tale of nine generations in a rural Pennsylvania manor. This is more than a genealogy: it is a restoration of a mansion (White Chimneys) as well as a family. The two themes mesh well, each lending greater depth to the other.

White Chimneys was the Slaymaker family estate in Gap, Pennsylvania, just outside the county seat of Lancaster. At once a museum piece and family home, its architecture reveals the proclivities of its owners as well as changing American tastes. Since additions to the house followed additions to the family, each generation left its imprint without destroying that of its predecessors. Improvement often led to deterioration; Victorian settees stood next to Chippendale chairs, daguerrotypes hung alongside oils, foun-
tains and pools replaced overrun gardens. In 1955 the author inherited the property and set out to reverse the process of decay. His discovery of a remarkably complete collection of family papers in an old garret sparked his interest—time, hard work, and considerable expenditure of money provided the wherewithal for restoration. The narrative is as personal as it is historical. It reaches the curious and amateur as well as the professional historian.

In 1710 Mathias Schleiermacher (Slaymaker) and a party of German Calvinists came to the Pequea Valley in Pennsylvania to find religious freedom. Hope of political rewards soon induced Mathias to Anglicize his name, so he changed it to Slaymaker. Slaymaker fortunes successfully negotiated the vicissitudes of colonial and revolutionary politics, and by the 1790s the family had indulged in turnpike construction and land speculation. Judicious investments, political favors, and careful attention to tollgates marked the progress of a budding entrepreneur, Amos Slaymaker. With Lancaster about to become the new state capital, Amos constructed rental houses (and his own house) along the turnpike route and started a stage line. He also utilized local politics to promote upward mobility, turning his post as justice of the peace to personal gain with a thriving real estate business. In 1806 Amos entered the state senate, an advance signaled by the construction of a new addition to his mansion. The most interesting and successful of the Slaymakers, Amos saw one business venture after another take root and become profitable.

Yet more important than Amos's successes are the insights into the lives and habits of less prosperous members of the community and family. Education, religion, and politics concerned everyone, not just the affluent and influential. The book's strength lies in its revelation of the daily activities of a business-minded family. Like many Americans, Slaymakers fought in the Civil War and endured its trials at home, mourned Lincoln's funeral train as it passed, and then invested in railroads and manufacturing during the Gilded Age. All the while the family maintained its links to the land—passing from farmers to gentlemen farmers to landlords. Each generation became a "captive" of the mansion, investing far more time and money than logic or financial resources seemed to dictate in an effort to leave their mark. Like his predecessors, this Slaymaker acknowledges his own captivity.

Some difficulties unfortunately, mar this fine work. The failure to provide a bibliography, essay on sources, or footnotes is most distressing. Slaymaker has at hand a model for genealogists and social historians, but he fails to tell us where he found the information on his ancestors not contained in those boxes discovered in the garret. The types of records consulted, not just specific citations, need to be noted. What did he find useful?—court or church records, newspapers, unpublished or published diaries? The list might be endless—but very revealing. More important, it might help other genealogists and family chroniclers produce something more socially and historically significant than the ubiquitous family tree.

In short, what Slaymaker has produced is a fascinating and instructive narrative on family (and self) reconstruction. He has provided throughout many caveats for others to heed. Let us hope that some will follow his lead.

Professor Sheehan thinks that until he set to work historians believed that Indians looked about the same to our colonial and early national ancestors as they look to us. "It has been difficult to explain government policy," he writes, "without resorting to moral injunctions because writers have seldom taken into account the white man's perception of the Indian as well as the anthropological description of the tribesman." To redress this situation, Sheehan has written a long and detailed treatise on white Americans' attitudes toward red Americans from the Revolution to the Age of Jackson. He has prepared himself well—for his task, mastering the anthropological literature of the American Enlightenment (and many significant European works), missionary papers, letters and policy statements by federal officials, travel accounts, "captivity narratives," and a quantity of secondary works.

Other scholars—Winthrop Jordan most recently—have led us through the ideas that eighteenth-century men held about the unity of mankind, and the great influence they attributed to environment in causing the obvious differences among the races of men. They consequently thought that Indians would quickly become indistinguishable from whites, by abandoning hunting and warfare in favor of agriculture, literacy, and Christianity. For the good of himself and the whole world, the Indian should grow rapidly from savagery to civilization. Missionaries tended to schools and churches, while government agents tried to control the Indian trade so that useful items like hoes, harnesses, and plows would flow into the tribal households.

The yearning for simplicity that partly characterized eighteenth-century thinkers helped them imagine the "noble savage," and this unfortunately made white men still more optimistic about the Indian's adaptability. Idealistic and sentimental, Jeffersonians hoped to occupy North America as rapidly as possible with hard working and peaceful farmers, conveniently overlooking the obstacles to "civilizing" Indians. They warmly encouraged intermarriage, without seeing that males of the stronger culture took females from the weaker, and that their issue belonged to neither. They financed Indian schools in which the children of mighty warriors and bold hunters had to endure strict discipline, mean surroundings, and (however well-meaning the missionary teacher) endless condescension. The half-civilized Indian startled the enlightened whites by imitating white nationalism, and becoming (as in Pontiac's Confederation, the Creeks, and the Cherokee) not less but more resistant to incorporation and assimilation.

Neither philanthropic nor federal agents could prevent the worst interaction of whites and redskins. Dependence on trading goods, addiction to alcohol, frontier wars, and new diseases killed off the native Americans.
more rapidly than missionaries could teach them English. And the image of the diabolical Indian largely replaced the image of the noble savage. Decent and literate white men, themselves safely removed from the frontier, read widely and uncritically in the popular literature of Indian atrocities, whose vogue greatly increased after the eastern Indians had given up fighting. Removal west of the Mississippi was the last nostrum of a philanthropy determined to save the Indian from destruction and the frontier from savagery.

Sheehan's is a powerful and informed argument; it can not fail to instruct students of early national history, and by extension it must improve our understanding of the whole unhappy history of the American Indians. But like so many scholars with important new approaches and insights, Sheehan has carried one of his beyond the bounds of plausibility. At the beginning he writes, "The philanthropic mind was at base obtrusive and compulsive in its determination to have its way . . . . It conceded native society nothing in the way of permanence." And, in conclusion: "Ultimately, hating Indians could not be differentiated from hating Indian-ness. If the frontiersman adopted the direct method of murdering Indians, humanitarians were only more circumspect in demanding cultural suicide of the tribes . . . . The white man's sympathy was more deadly than his animosity. Philanthropy had in mind the disappearance of an entire race." Yet Sheehan reminds us elsewhere that while Indian culture disintegrated and tribes disappeared, the American Indian somehow survived. It is altogether proper and instructive to deplore the smugness and ethnocentricity of the rulers, lay and ecclesiastical, in Jeffersonian America; but where in the world today do any of the cultures of five hundred years ago still flourish? Missionary, capitalist, nationalist, and socialist have all been ruthless in forcing "backward" people to become "civilized." And I hope we take a more favorable view of racial types gradually disappearing because of intermarriage than by means of systematic destruction.

It is moral nonsense to say that the man who taught the Indians to pray and to plow did more harm than the man who sold them whiskey or shot them dead. And this overrational approach leads Sheehan to ignore the considerable difference in tactics that divided Federalists from Republicans. Had Federalists retained control during the early 1800s, we might very well have been spared the last great sequence of eastern Indian wars. "Indian-ness" would have still been doomed, but hundreds of Indians and whites would have survived.

*The University of Illinois, Urbana*

ROBERT MCCOLLEY


The American way of war is unique. Unlike other international powers, the United States was not forced to develop a formal body of strategic doctrine until the end of the Second World War. *The American Way of War* by Russell Weigley concerns the reluctance of the American military profession to come to grips with the necessities of the development of a military policy
related to the demands of national security.

To explain the gestation of American military policy, Dr. Weigley begins with the Revolution. That strategy should be national in scope was not a major consideration then and became one only at the beginning of the Cold War. The national coastal defense plan of 1821 was the only real attempt to concentrate on a national security goal. And the impact of the ensuing system of fortifications was to focus interest upon a defensive strategy. Technology, Jominian interpretations of Napoleonic warfare, and the Mexican War did little to advance native American strategic thought. The writings of D. H. Mahan, H. W. Halleck, and William Hardee only grafted onto the American scene the continental European doctrines of national warfare, "great and decisive battles," and the need to operate on interior lines.

Weigley's treatment of the Civil War encompasses the Napoleonic strategy of Robert E. Lee and the annihilation doctrine of Grant and Sherman. The Southern doctrine of the offensive-defense practiced by Lee enabled the South to make a respectable showing in the first two years of the war. But after Grant came to the command of the Union army and constantly engaged the Army of Northern Virginia, the Southern cause was lost. It was during the Civil War that the first foundation of American military doctrine emerged—the direct involvement of armed forces in the destruction of enemy manpower and economic resources.

The second of these foundations of American military thought, the naval doctrines of Mahan and the need to acquire battleships in order to fight a great and decisive naval engagement, appeared on the scene before the end of the nineteenth century. The indecisive nature of the First World War and the breaking of the deadlock with tanks should have forecast changes in the future of land warfare, but throughout the 1920s amid the cry of the air power and armor advocates, the United States and other nations refused to heed the lessons of that war. Despite the doctrines of Douhet, Billy Mitchell, and Seversky, air power was still accorded a secondary role in the future of war. The Navy concentrated upon the problems of carrying a war to Japan. Carrier doctrine and amphibious warfare received considerable attention, but the big battle advocates of the Mahan school still dominated. The Second World War would find a combination of the annihilation doctrines of Grant and the big battle notions of Mahan dominating American actions. It would not be until after 1950 that Americans would be concerned about the strategy of the use of the nation's armed forces.

The two chapters on the Second World War alone are worth the price of the book. The coverage of the Pacific Theater is nicely balanced, and the treatment of strategic developments in Europe is indicative of the depth of Weigley's research and preparations in the writing of this work. He is equally at home with the various parts of the total war in Europe. His analysis of the Anglo-American rivalry for strategic options is definitive and understandable. In all, the historical narrative is one of precise statement of fact interlaced with cogent analyses of the war's developments. The story of air power and its use in both theaters is a definite bonus for the reader.

With the advent of the Korean War the United States began drawing up
plans for national and international security. It is at this point that the author’s analysis achieves its most telling effect, for he carefully outlines the many difficulties the strategists experienced in coming to grips with the new problems of devising a national strategic doctrine. The net impact of nuclear weapons, the confusing dimensions of the Cold War, and the internecine struggle within the Defense Department for primacy in the defense of the nation complicated matters. The problems of Cold War diplomacy within the State Department and the difficulties of all of the post-war presidents in establishing national leadership and direction for America’s new international role receive considerable attention.

The influence of the civilian strategists upon national security planning, the “think tanks,” the nuclear balance of terror, coupled with the inability of the nation to use its doctrines of conventional war to defeat guerrillas in Southeast Asia brought to view new concepts of national strategy. The American way of war is no longer simply the use of force to bring about a decision on the battlefield. It is now one which also entails the new doctrines of limited war and the concepts of deterrence with threats of nuclear retaliation. “Because the record of nonnuclear war in obtaining acceptable decisions at a tolerable cost is scarcely heartening,” according to Weigley, “the history of usable combats may at last be reaching its end.” Perhaps Americans are learning that the ways of war are in a constant state of flux. Instead of being solely the province of the military professionals, national strategy is now formed by a combination of civilian and military inputs. The new national security strategy has led to a new way of war.

Having been written from a wealth of primary and secondary sources, The American Way of War provides a broad survey of the literature of American military history and the development of strategic doctrines. It is a very significant study which deserves widespread attention.

Davidson County Community College                    Samuel R. Bright
Lexington, N. C.
was director of research for the society. Drawing on the magnificent library, manuscript, and iconographic collections of the historical society, on recently opened collections in the National Archives in Washington, and on her own intimate knowledge of Wisconsin history, she has produced a readable yet closely documented account of the origins of Wisconsin society.

As the author notes in the preface, this book is actually a history of Wisconsin territory only during the period of American dominance, 1815 to 1848. Four introductory chapters—less than one-fifth of the total pages—are devoted to the period prior to the War of 1812; Smith refers the reader to the works of Louise Phelps Kellogg for the antecedent phases of French and British exploration, exploitation, and control. In this sense the title misleads somewhat, for what has clearly been a massive research effort centers on the relatively brief but critical span of thirty years leading from territory to statehood.

The author divides the history into traditional categories: six chapters deal strictly with political developments; two discuss the politically-related issues of banking and internal improvements; and five treat Indian relations, pioneer life, "cultural beginnings," and religious movements. The author is at her best in relating the political careers and economic machinations of the aggressive territorial elite—men such as Henry Dodge, James Duane Doty, and George W. Jones. Although the minutes of legislative meetings and detailed constitutional provisions at times are presented a bit starkly, these chapters generally present a full and competent political history of the territorial period.

*From Exploration to Statehood* is, however, a success story. Perhaps with an eye to later volumes in the series Smith lays the social, economic, and political foundations for the events of subsequent decades in the heterogeneity, aggressive capitalistic spirit, and opportunity-loving independance of the American and European settlers of the early nineteenth century. Observing that in 200 years of explorations and control the French and British left no visible imprint on the Wisconsin region, the author finds the roots of greatness in the "melee of experimentation, misunderstanding, disappointment, rivalry and strife" of the post-1815 era. Thus while we learn little of the daily life of the female portion of the population—or of most of the males for that matter, the fur trading empire of Ramsay Crooks and the vigorous entrepreneurial efforts in lumbering, water power, and mining receive detailed coverage.

A disturbing note of historical inevitability and an assumption of progressive development pervade the book, and nowhere do they protrude more visibly than in the discussion of Indian-white relations. Adopting the value judgments of Indian-handler Henry Dodge, the author relates the tragic story of white aggrandizement and Indian removal with a mixture of pity and censure toward the Indian. After reading of the endless removals of the Fox by both whites and other Indians, we find that the Fox were "fierce and warlike, . . . improvident and intemperate." After learning that Black Hawk's followers were starving for lack of corn, we are reminded that his fight was in his eyes a "moral crusade"; while other chiefs, "mindful of their treaty obligations," led their peoples from their homelands, Black Hawk
“hung on.” “Promises made in Washington,” Smith tells us, “were broken in Wisconsin”—referring to the Winnebago! The “stubborn resistance” of this unfortunate people to moving south of the Missouri River posed particular problems in the “wearisome struggle” of Governor Dodge and others to enforce Indian land treaties. In tracing the change “from primitive wilderness into civilized pursuits,” Smith comes perilously close at times to callous historical justification. Thus it seems that when “their turn came” in 1848, the Menominee had little choice, since “the expanding white population needed territory, and could make more intense use of it than could Indian hunters.” If there are such inevitabilities in history, they are to be defined, not assumed.

While it is an admirable, comprehensive account of political and economic developments in territorial Wisconsin, this volume lacks a sense of alternatives, of roads not taken. Miss Smith’s thin chapter on cultural developments, as well as the exploitation and destruction of the aboriginal inhabitants of the Wisconsin region, should remind us that what has been did not necessarily have to be, and that things of value are lost or denied as well as gained along the way. The aggressive greed and ambition that provides the underlying theme of this book may serve the valuable purpose of demonstrating, as we approach our 200th national birthday, the price of a state’s “greatness.”

Colgate University

Curtis M. Hinsley, Jr.