
Stephen Girard was a Frenchman born in 1750 who came to Philadelphia in 1776. Girard, along with another migrant, John Jacob Astor, became one of America’s richest men in the immediate post-Revolutionary period. Girard’s fortune stemmed from his activities as a ship owner and sedentary merchant. He prospered greatly during the early part of the Napoleonic wars, and he was clever enough to recall most of his assets to the United States immediately prior to the outbreak of war with England in 1812.

Stephen Girard used his very considerable recalled assets to start his banking enterprise in 1812. His establishment opened in the building formerly occupied by the First Bank of the United States, the charter of which had been allowed by the Republicans to lapse in 1811. Although Girard’s bank immediately became one of Philadelphia’s largest, it was unique. It operated throughout its entire life as a private institution with no state or federal charter. The bank was entirely controlled by Girard, and it died with him in 1831.

From the very first Girard faced serious challenges. Foremost was the opposition of the chartered Pennsylvania banks. They feared a potent new competitor and worked to have the state legislature outlaw the new bank. Equally serious was the specie shortage which occurred during the latter phases of the War of 1812. Another issue was the relationship of Girard’s bank to the federal treasury. In the early years Girard’s problems were as much political as financial. A strong Republican, Girard attempted to use his influence with the various secretaries of the treasury (Albert Gallatin, Alexander Dallas, William Jones, and George Campbell), who were his friends, to have his bank recognized on equal terms with the other Philadelphia institutions. Girard attempted to use his leverage in the purchase of federal securities to gain status as a federal depository with the same privileges accorded to the important chartered banks. When he failed in this he took a leading role in founding the new Second Bank of the United States to which Madison appointed him to serve as one of the initial government directors. Girard’s prominent role with the new federal bank helped his private bank win acceptance in Philadelphia.
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Donald Adams, an economist, has written an internal study of Girard's bank. It is based mostly on the extensive Stephen Girard manuscript collection, the microfilms of which are held in the America Philosophical Society library in Philadelphia. Adams's work pays only nominal attention to the politics of banking; he relies for his insight in this area on the splendid works already available by Bray Hammond and Fritz Redlich. Adams's main contribution is a study of Girard's banking operations. He is interested in such things as the ratio of commercial to non-commercial loans, the length and renewability of loans, the ratio of specie holdings to bank note issue, and loan/asset ratios. Adams's research gives us very positive answers to questions such as these on a year-by-year basis from 1812 to 1831, and he is able to compare the Girard bank's policies with those of other key Pennsylvania banks. Adams's conclusion is that despite its unorthodox status as an unchartered bank, Stephen Girard's institution was extremely conservative, and it differed little from such institutions as the Bank of Pennsylvania or the Bank of North America. Girard favoured short-term, non-renewable loans to merchants that ran for between 60 days and 180 days. He avoided making long-term commitments either to the merchantile community or to new types of borrowers such as industrialists and internal improvement corporations. Only toward the end of the bank's career in the mid-1820s did Girard become involved substantially in non-commercial loans as those to the Schuylkill Navigation Company and on coal lands in Mahoney and Cattawissa.

Professor Adams has written a superb book. Although he is an economist writing about the most technical aspects of banking, he does so in a clear, jargon-free manner that can be understood by any literate historian. Although his book is filled with hard statistical data, he merely attempts to reconstruct the Girard bank's experience. He does not use counter-factual models, nor is there anything about his method that will puzzle an ordinary historian. Adams is to be congratulated for demonstrating the insight that an economist can bring to historical material.

The University of Sydney, Australia.

Stephen Salsbury


Pennsylvania's Decorative Arts traces the development of handcrafted decorative arts in Pennsylvania from the colonial era to the present time. The focus is upon the persistence of traditional handcraft in spite of the increasingly dominant influence of machine-made decorative arts. It is concluded that contemporary decorative arts reflect the machine age enhanced by handcraft either by reaction or choice.

The book deals with forms of furniture including style designations and stylistic characteristics, woods used, and some construction details. It features accessories and household implements. Specifically covered are items made from wood, metal, ceramics, glass, textiles, and paper. Coverage includes clocks, baskets, slip-decorated redware, scherenschnitte (paper cutting), and fraktur.
The selection of plates of decorative arts for illustrative purposes is superb. The plates portray the beauty of Pennsylvania's decorative arts and clearly show stylistic details. Some of the supporting statements however, are misleading. Gateleg tables, for example, were not the original space-saving devices. The Trestle table, dismantled and leaned against the wall, and the chair/table predate it.

Emphasis upon regional characteristics of Pennsylvania's decorative arts is limited. Statements, for the most part, are general in nature and indicative of handcrafted decorative arts throughout America. The author does stress the eastern segment of the state with the Pennsylvania Germans' area being featured. But, more emphasis upon the unique aspects of Pennsylvania's decorative arts in relation to the diverse group of people who settled the land and their culture could have made this book significant in the field and an important contribution to the study of decorative arts.

The book is not a scholarly contribution to the decorative arts in Pennsylvania. It provides a concise summary of information available elsewhere. It is a good broad general overview of decorative arts. In light of space limitations and price considerations, it should be of value to the person who is a novice in the field and desires some background information regarding decorative arts with some emphasis upon the arts in Pennsylvania.

*Indiana University of Pennsylvania*  

**DONNA STREIFTHAU**


In the past decade American historians have devoted a good deal of attention to questions concerning class and social mobility. The availability of sources and the Horatio Alger myth have drawn many of them to the nineteenth century. Although geographical differences proved to be relevant in some cases, these studies agree that a maldistribution of wealth has characterized American society, that the economic elite came from substantial families, and that vertical mobility usually came in small increments—not from "rags-to-riches," but, at best, from "rags-to-respectability."

In *The Iron Barons*, John Ingham attempts to draw a social portrait of the men who dominated the iron and steel industry in the late nineteenth century. Because of technological advances at the time, the industry assumed a crucial importance in American economic development which makes this elite an obvious test of the "rags-to-riches" legend. Ingham's sample even includes the most famous of the real "poor-boys-who-made-good," Andrew Carnegie.

This study is based upon a collective biography of 696 men from six major centers of the industry who are listed as company officers in the *Directory of Iron and Steel Manufacturing Plants of the United States and Canada*. Aside from the "Iron Barons" of Pittsburgh, Ingham examines those of
Philadelphia, Cleveland, Youngstown, Wheeling, and Bethlehem. (Actually, Ingham has practically nothing to say about the last town.) The book is structured around two chapters using Pittsburgh to create models of the social make-up of the iron and steel elite and of the web of social institutions that maintained its existence. Each is followed by a chapter comparing the "Pittsburgh model" with the other cities. There are also the mandatory introduction on similar studies, a quasi-theoretical chapter on the function of upper-class institutions, and a somewhat detached conclusion.

The organization of *The Iron Barons* makes it difficult reading. There is no reason why the reader should have to endure this kind of repetitious presentation simply because the research design calls for the replication of the analysis in five different cities. The conclusions from the collective biography are less than startling, but useful. There were interesting ethnoreligious differences between the elites of different cities and a high proportion of the Wheeling iron and steel elite did come from working-class origins. However, Ingham has shown clearly that the "Iron Barons" were overwhelmingly from well-off, Anglo-American, Protestant backgrounds. The dominance of the specifically English or Scotch-Irish and, among those groups, the Presbyterians and Episcopalians stands out. Ingham's discussion of marriage, education, and social club membership is more enlightening even if it represents only an extension of the work of Digby Baltzell and a confirmation of the common view that the rich prefer "their own kind."

Some of Ingham's larger conclusions, however, do pose problems. The final chapter might better be entitled "Speculations" because it moves off significantly from the previous discussion. It would be difficult to argue either with his claim that there was a high degree of class continuity or his view that "the role of the businessman was not confined to the business alone." But when he implies that most "deals" are made in clubs, he sounds like a businessman padding his expense account with a convenient myth. He ignores the mechanisms by which life style might determine the conduct of business, although he says it does. Similarly, he implies these men shared class attitudes, but refuses to probe this very difficult problem. His are reasonable suppositions; *The Iron Barons*, unfortunately, offers no new evidence to document them.

Ingham does attempt to systematically analyse one major thesis that reappears throughout the book. He argues that the iron and steel elites of his cities were community oriented, i.e., they were basically "locals" rather than "cosmopolitans." This is certainly a startling conclusion. Unfortunately, Ingham has operationalized Merton's concepts solely in terms of marriage ties—discounting his own evidence on education. This assumes great importance when one realizes that the original concepts referred to interpersonal influence and focused upon orientation relative to the content of national news magazines. Nor has Ingham replicated the kind of analysis Schultz did of Ford executives in Ypsilanti. He ignores his elites' political interest entirely; yet, his small town elites of Bethlehem and Youngstown increasingly move into the orbit of the nearest
metropolis. Perhaps more interesting to the general historian is that this iconoclastic view—if Ingham is correct—would force total revision of the most commonly accepted explanation of the relationship between economic development and the political realignment of the 1890s.

Lehigh University

William G. Shade


A few years ago the columnist Garry Wills said while reviewing another work that a Johns Hopkins dissertation by Richard Alan Ryerson was "the best modern study of Pennsylvania's Revolution" in 1776. Ryerson himself in the published version of the dissertation now at hand seems to have qualified that praise through his subtitle, which makes clear his study does not focus on Pennsylvania but on The Radical Committees of Philadelphia, 1765–1776. Yet throughout the book he seems to equate what happened in Philadelphia with Pennsylvania, as when he remarks "that the Revolution in Pennsylvania was the creation—and the creator—of new political men" (254). Even so, his book unquestionably merits Wills' encomium.

Wills in the review also remarked that Ryerson disagrees with the thesis in David Freeman Hawke's In the Midst of a Revolution that the Revolution in Pennsylvania was carried out by a few gentlemen who staged a coup in Philadelphia in the spring of 1776. Since both books cover much the same ground, the comparison with Hawke's work is inevitable, and even a prejudiced reader must admit that of the two, Hawke's comes off as an impressionistic narrative alongside Ryerson's massively documented analysis. Nonetheless, the evidence offered by Ryerson did not convince Wills that Hawke's thesis had been effectively rebutted. To him it appeared both authors agreed that some twenty or so Philadelphia gentlemen through assiduous propaganda carried Pennsylvania into the independence column in 1776. Ryerson, too, would seem to agree when he says that "the propaganda campaign for independence was a massive assault by a half dozen of more spirited ultraradicals upon half as many anti-Independents" (p. 170). But such a quotation, out of context, is unfair, for Ryerson holds emphatically that the radical committees of Philadelphia from 1774 on "consistently enjoyed broad popular support." The uprising that demolished the old provincial establishment in May 1776 may have been a coup, but it also had the backing of the people. Hawke sees the election of May 1776, where the Independents lost to the Reconciliation ticket, as a startling upset only five weeks before the resolution for independence was introduced in Congress; Ryerson sees it as an impressive indication of the Independents' strength. The issue, it would seem, becomes personal—some see the sky partly cloudy, others partly sunny; some see the glass half full, others half empty.

Ryerson's affection for the word "radical" reveals that in the years since In the Midst of a Revolution came out Hawke has lost his battle to purge the
label from studies of the American Revolution. He preferred “Reconciliationists” and “Independents” as more accurate identifications. Ryerson has reverted to a pattern established by Merrill Jensen in his work on the Articles of Confederation, dividing the politicians of the day into radicals and conservatives. Now, radical is a loaded word, one to which every reader brings a pre-formed definition. Ryerson knows this and as a meticulous scholar he uses the word with care, defining and re-defining it at least six times as political alignments change, and when the running definition won’t work he brings in “ultraradical” to clarify (or confuse) matters. This tortuous precision leads to confusion. John Dickinson, a radical, is described “as ever cautious” (p. 49), then, when compared to another less radical he becomes “somewhat more radical” (p. 50).

Ryerson favors another loaded word—“mechanics,” an eighteenth-century label which he scrupulously defines as “master craftsmen and retailers of modest wealth” (p. 72n). The reader is asked to wash from his mind the twentieth-century conception of a mechanic as a “grease-monkey” or someone who works with his hands. When Ryerson says that the mechanics took control of Philadelphia’s radical committees after 1774, he only means that a younger, less wealthy group who embraced a broader range of occupations, a wider “ethnic and religious affiliation,” had come to power, but they did not represent the vanguard of a democratic revolution. They were “a new elite” and would after independence create “a new establishment.” The “mechanic revolution,” as he calls it, was led “largely by men of modest fortune.”

Ryerson estimates that approximately a thousand of these “mechanics” entered politics between 1774 and 1776, and his detailed charts and tables substantiate his view. He also holds that these middle-class gentlemen, as they might be more accurately called, transformed what had been a resistance movement against British authority into a real revolution, and that from the summer of 1775 on “the rising demand for a new conception of the social order soon to be expressed in new democratic processes of government, was an indispensable factor in the pacing, the depth, and the results of Pennsylvania’s Revolution” (p. 255). This generalization should stir up historians fascinated by the Revolution in Pennsylvania and keep them occupied for years to come. Ryerson has produced a major work that cannot be lightly dismissed.

Lehman College, City University of New York

DAVID FREEMAN HAWKE


When Alan Tully looked closely at Pennsylvania during the period from 1726 to 1755, he was “impressed” by the “existence of a whole series of widely shared social experiences, informal relationships, lines of influence, institutional arrangements, divisions of power, and forms of legislative behavior that worked to order political affairs, regularize decision making, and resolve conflict.” He did not see the “milling factionalism,” “the constant strife, chronic instability” and rampant paranoia that has character-
ized the prevailing view of pre-Revolutionary America since the 1960s. In other words, William Penn’s legacy was political stability for mid-eighteenth-century Pennsylvania.

The author argues that Pennsylvania politics during the thirty-year period under study was characterized by accommodation. The established political leaders of the colony, be they provincial officials or members of the Assembly, which he characterizes as a “well-insulated, relatively closed political body,” worked through established procedures that kept potential confrontations from becoming major divisions. The predominant mood was one of “conciliation, restraint and at times even boredom.”

In Part One, Tully provides a survey of political events during the period 1726–1755, demonstrating how this politics of conciliation operated. He discusses the border fight with Maryland as a stabilizing influence as the various political factions attempted to put forth a united front against an external threat. He shows how one of the few divisive incidents of the period, the struggle over military preparedness in the early 1740s, also created a situation that would lead to increased stability in later years as the Quakers became identified as the defenders of popular rights and legislative privilege.

In the second part of the book, “Bases of Political Stability,” Tully presents a number of interesting points. For example, he discusses the community structure of colonial Pennsylvania and concludes that it was an open and resilient structure that allowed unity to develop. He makes the very important point that Pennsylvania’s structure did not have “membership congruence between political, economic, and religious groups” as we have seen present in the closed, corporate communities of New England.

The author also provides a useful analysis of voter participation during the period and concludes that only about one-third of the taxables voted and that, on some occasions, participation declined to one-quarter to one-fifth of the eligible electorate. He also discusses how this lower voter participation helped the Quakers maintain their dominance over Pennsylvania politics.

The book is based on extensive research in the primary sources, particularly for areas outside of Philadelphia, and the author has command of the monographic material. Yet, one gets the feeling that this is a book that asserts rather than demonstrates; the existence of political stability seems to be more of an organizing premise than a basis of analysis. For example, after discussing the lack of authority that local government had, both at the township and county level, and the fact that there was no “membership congruence” between various groups in society, the author simply asserts that, nonetheless, this structure created unity.

If one is going to discuss the development of political stability as a function of social structure, there are a number of topics that need closer examination: the geographical mobility of the population; the impact of the large number of non-English immigrants who had no experience with the political system of Pennsylvania; the disruptive influence of land policies that continued to agitate the backcountry into the 1750s; and the economic makeup of the population. Finally, one has to question whether you can extrapolate political stability for colonial Pennsylvania and all of colonial America from a thirty-year period of analysis, as Tully tries to do. This is
particularly true when that thirty-year period of stability is wedged between two politically factious times—the first two decades of the eighteenth century and the period of the Great War for Empire.

Nonetheless, Tully has presented us with a useful book that fills a gap in the historiography of Pennsylvania. He proposes a number of new approaches to the study of old questions, and proposes the concept of political stability as a useful tool for the analysis of eighteenth-century America.

*The Pennsylvania State University
Delaware County Campus

George W. Franz


One cannot help but be astonished by the continuing fascination historians and antiquarians have had for Major General Edward Braddock's stunning defeat at the Battle of the Monongahela, 9 July 1755. The engagement, of course, was significant in terms of the eventual course of the Seven Years' War in America, but it seems to have generated any number of collateral investigations—into how many horses Braddock had shot out from under him, on those among the British army who went on to greater fame and fortune (or misfortune), of claims that the general was shot by one of his own men, and of long and presumably costly searches for Braddock's "lost treasure." With all that in mind, this reviewer began reading this new study of Braddock's defeat encumbered by an admittedly skeptical, if not genuinely hostile, bias.

Fortunately, there are a number of pleasant surprises in Kopperman's volume. Laudatory is the author's methodological thoroughness. He has sifted through a vast amount of primary and secondary material, and in his introduction provides one of the better essays on how to weigh the relative merits of documentary data. First-hand accounts of the battle by both British and French participants naturally receive the most attention, but Kopperman still takes care to ensure that there is adequate corroboration of them from other sources. Wilderness warfare comes alive in the author's description of the march out of Fort Cumberland, the many problems Braddock faced in garnering supplies from recalcitrant and dishonest provisioners, and the agonizingly slow progress made by the British column as it cut its way through the forest.

The battle itself Kopperman dissects and analyzes in painstaking detail, using the eyewitness accounts to best advantage. He treats Braddock fairly and judiciously, concluding that although the general did commit errors, he fought bravely and tried in vain to rally his men. Panic among the troops and blunders by Colonel Thomas Gage, in command of the advance party, Kopperman asserts, primarily contributed to the British disaster, but underlying reasons, such as the numerous delays in the march and the failure adequately to recruit Indians, must also be considered. Covered, too, is the aftermath of the battle in both its short and long term consequences. Interestingly. Braddock's defeat had a major impact on Pennsylvania Quakers, whose accession to increased militia calls was the
"beginning of the end" of their overweening political power in the province (p. 129). Further work in this area would be welcome.

Nearly one-half of the book consists of appendixes. These provide an excellent survey of the historical literature on the battle, as well as transcriptions, summaries, and commentaries on the accounts used by the author in his research. Although it is a service to bring these documents together in one volume, and some of the translations of French accounts are more accurate than previous ones, most are printed and available elsewhere. The student of the battle most willing to read these would probably have been equally interested in following up on one of the author's footnotes. As it stands, the appendixes, though informative, seem to be filler for what otherwise would have been a slim volume.

On the whole, however, this is a book deserving of praise. It is well written, competently researched, and thoroughly documented. Scholars should not have to reexamine Braddock's defeat for some time to come.

Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania

WILLIAM F. TRIMBLE


A person well qualified to give us a biography of Sir William Johnson is Milton Hamilton, retired New York State Historian, editor of the Johnson Papers, and author of more than a score of articles about Sir William. In this first volume of a projected two-volume biography, the author carries Sir William's story down to 1763, through nearly a generation of tension and strife on the New York colonial frontier. Hamilton does an exemplary job of research; his documentation, which is copious, is virtually all from primary sources. The author presents the results of his research in a manner which may not be to the taste of some readers by quoting extensively from his sources, by arranging his material in episodic fashion, and by adopting at times too much the role of advocate. But be that as it may, Hamilton clearly is knowledgeable about the details of Sir William's life.

Certain details have a strong voice in the biography by virtue of the author's emphasis, especially those about military affairs. In some of those affairs during two colonial wars Sir William was a spectator, living the life of a successful businessman near Albany; in others he was a participant, chosen to command on the assumption that success in civilian life qualified him for military leadership. As to whether the assumption was correct, one might say that on the rather short list of successful colonial military leaders, Sir William's name deserves inclusion, but not acclaim. In two battles, one in 1755 at Lake George and the other in 1759 at Fort Niagara (which location the author unaccountably calls the key to the continent), Sir William commanded the usual quarrelsome, laboriously assembled colonial levies and won ragged victories for which he could take little credit—and for which his contemporaries gave him little. "A very good and valuable man," was Sir William according to a colleague, "but utterly a stranger to military affairs." It would seem then that Sir William's participation in military affairs is a feeble foundation upon which to rest his reputation, either with his contemporaries or with posterity.
Other details, those dealing with Indian diplomacy, Sir William's forte, have a weaker voice in the biography. Even so, the location of Sir William's estate along the Mohawk River and his involvement in the fur trade brought him early into contact with the Iroquois. He gained the respect of those Indians because he was about as sympathetic to their interests as a British subject could be and because he treated the Indians as near equals to himself, even to the point of taking an Indian wife. His respected position among the tribes and his natural gift for Indian diplomacy allowed him to exert considerable influence among the Iroquois on behalf of the English, brought him the appointment as Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Northern Department in 1755, and apparently had a lot to do with his receiving a baronetcy from George II the same year. These and related achievements are a more solid foundation upon which to rest a reputation.

To gauge the true, public measure of the man, a reader of this biography will have to bear in mind the potent position of the Iroquois at the time. Their good will brought New Yorkers considerable benefit; their ill will might have brought all of the colonies considerable harm. In the last analysis, the colonies could retain the Iroquois' good will only by satisfying the Indians' economic interests. This the colonies could do by guaranteeing the Iroquois their traditional place in the fur trade, by keeping the price of trade goods low and the quality high, by eliminating abuses in the wilderness marketplace, and, increasingly, by protecting Indian land claims against the machinations of speculators. A tall order! The great challenge of Indian diplomacy, and the challenge that Sir William met as well as anyone, was to represent those interests with sympathy and understanding to indifferent or hostile colonial governments and, in turn, to represent the governments' interests to the Indians. The fact that he could do that while keeping the confidence of both sides is a credit to his ability as a diplomat and is a more solid reason to remember his name to posterity.

Canton, Ohio

David Hardcastle


Lincoln University was founded in 1854 as an educational institution for black, male students. The school was established in Pennsylvania by men with "deep religious conviction" and commitment to found and maintain a Presbyterian college for the purpose of training black ministers as missionaries for the "Glorification of God by Africa" (p. 127, 142).

John Miller Dickey, the founder of Lincoln University, was an active worker in the colonization movement and served as an officer in the Pennsylvania Colonization Society. Dickey later reported that he became interested in establishing a preparatory and theological school as a result of his efforts to secure admission to a seminary for a "very superior colored man" to be trained as a missionary to Africa. After "trying vainly almost every school in the Union" known to him, Dickey finally took the responsibility of tutoring the student himself (p. 211).
The supporters of Lincoln University during the early period were advocates of the colonization movement. The historians of the antislavery movement have made a convincing case against the colonization society as an anti-Negro movement which incited violence against blacks as a part of a plan to encourage free blacks to migrate to Africa. Without laboring the point, Bond has shown that the colonization movement contained a segment of benevolent conservatives who held on to hopes that the final results of the colonization movement would bring freedom to numerous individual slaves, if not ultimate general emancipation. Joseph Hornblower, a prominent Presbyterian layman and Chief Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, and Cortlandt Van Rensselaer, a Presbyterian minister who served on the Board of Trustees of Lincoln University, were examples of men in the antislavery wing of the colonization movement.

The first eight chapters of the book deal with the genealogical and biographical heritage of John Miller Dickey. Bond believes that Dickey was motivated in establishing Lincoln University not only by Calvinistic influences, but also by the heritage of the Enlightenment and Quakerism, which came from his wife's family. Thus Bond's study is partially a history of the ideas responsible for the establishment of Lincoln University. Bond's purpose seems to be to evaluate the impact of philosophical, intellectual, and cultural changes upon the institutional character of the school and to delineate the evolutionary transformation that the college experienced. He identifies the major social forces that shaped the school's character as it moved into the twentieth century.

It is regrettable that Bond did not see fit to show how the split of the Presbyterian Church into the Old School and New School affected the destiny of the University. The Old School adhered to the colonization philosophy, and the New School was more closely identified with antislavery sentiment. The Presbytery of New Castle (Old School), which established the college, contained slaveholding churches, and Dickey and the trustees had the school's connection with the church broken under the terms of the new charter of 1866 because they feared the antislavery radicalism, as well as the "pro-slavery element," in the reconstituted presbytery when the Old and New Schools reunited (p. 429).

Bond finds that Lincoln University has fulfilled the goals set up by its founders. He concludes that "had the institution done nothing else, its African record would suffice to justify it" (p 509).

The book is weakened by the presentation of a large amount of undigested and unorganized material. At times Bond sacrifices unity and the easy flow of the narrative by giving extensive accounts of unimportant individuals.

In his treatment of the controversy concerning the struggle of the alumni and the young black intellectuals to end exclusive white control of the Board of Trustees and the faculty of Lincoln University, Bond could have put the controversy in a more balanced perspective if he had taken time to show that the revolt of the 1870s was a general trend in all black colleges which were established and controlled by white benevolence.
In spite of the weakness of the study, Bond's book is a significant contribution to the history of black education and is a worthy addition to his studies in the field. As a study of institutional history, it is in a select class with a few other books dealing with American colleges and universities, such as Godman Hislop's biography of Eliphalet Nott (1971), which deals with the nineteenth-century history of Union College.

Morehead State University

Victor B. Howard


Until fairly recently, the preoccupation of historians of the American Revolution with events in the eastern seaboard region has tended to cause the extremely significant developments along the inland frontiers to be unjustifiably subordinated. Fort Pitt and the Revolution on the Western Frontier is a valuable addition to the growing body of modern studies of these perhaps secondary, but nonetheless important, areas of operations.

Somewhat expanded from a series of articles in the Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine, this book is considerably more than an account of the military role of Fort Pitt during the war. At the outset, the author comes to grips with the complexities and the personalities involved in the dispute between Virginia and Pennsylvania over control of the region, providing an indispensable background to understanding some of the jurisdictional problems which later complicated the tasks of the successive commanders of the Western Department.

Williams traces the tours of these officers, bringing out the interplay of political, economic, and military factors confronting them and showing how each commander in turn was affected—and frustrated—by the same difficulties. We are given a devastating picture of the ambitious Daniel Brodhead, free with self-serving criticism of his commander, Lachlan McIntosh, only to find himself no more able to cope when he took over command. The treatment of Edward Hand is illuminating, and the only disappointment is that William Irvine, the one commander who completed his assignment without coming under a cloud, is not discussed more extensively.

The book is rich in detail, including painstaking identification of topography and routes, backed up by excellent maps. It is particularly valuable, also, for the extensive biographical information it provides on a number of figures whose records have been less familiar than the importance of their influence justifies.

Considered strictly as a narrative, this study might be faulted for its sometimes extreme annotation and for the tendency to quote the entire texts of letters and resolutions when an extract would have been adequate to make the point desired. On the other hand, the author's stated purpose was not merely to provide a narrative of events, but to make available pertinent documents, many of them not readily accessible, for use in further researches. In that respect he succeeded admirably, and this book will
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 unquestionably be a major source for scholars examining the area and the period.

There are grounds for minor criticism concerning perspective. For example, it is indisputable that if western Pennsylvania had come under British control the post-war expansion of the United States would have been much more difficult, if not impossible. However, Williams’s claim that “had Fort Pitt succumbed to the many real threats, the cause of American independence would have failed” must be considered an overstatement: the loss of the west would not have destroyed or even seriously weakened Washington’s army, and so long as that army remained intact, the Revolution could not be put down.

By the same token, the impact attributed to Brodhead’s 1779 expedition against the Indian towns along the upper Allegheny is exaggerated. Without doubt, it was valuable as a contribution to local security, but its effect so far as the overall conduct of the war is concerned was incidental beside that of Gen. John Sullivan’s simultaneous operations in the Finger Lakes region of New York.

It would be wrong, however, to dwell at any length on these defects, which are insignificant compared to the merits of the work. In any case, the author did not set out to survey the Revolutionary War as a whole, but to focus light on one of its important, but undeservedly obscure, aspects. In so doing he has made a substantial contribution to the enlargement of our knowledge and understanding of America’s Revolutionary experience in general.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

JOHN B. B. TRUSSELL, JR.


In this fine example of close historical scrutiny, Butler focuses on early denominations in the Delaware valley to assess their degree of democratization. For generations our common understanding of denominational transformation has followed variations of Turner’s frontier thesis which held that democracy was a by-product of the American environment. That easy generalization has now been tested against the surviving documents of four church groups which struggled to foster institutional growth primarily in Pennsylvania from its establishment in 1681 to the 1730s Great Awakening. By means of this valuable study Butler shows that hierarchic, aristocratic models were dominant ecclesiastical traits from the beginning and well into the eighteenth century. We can no longer proceed on the uncritical assumption that colonial churches quickly abandoned traditional patterns of authority for more open, dynamic ones engendered by New World circumstances.
An important feature of this carefully restricted investigation is that it utilizes records of what actually happened rather than drawing upon abstract statements about polity. During the first half century of Pennsylvania church life Quakers, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Anglicans tried to organize their work along lines already proven effective in England. The largest portion of Butler’s investigation is given over to substantial chapters supporting his conclusions on heavy clericalism and universal reluctance to depart from traditional institutional patterns. During the Keithian schism of 1691–93, Quakers augmented their denominational apparatus by rejecting egalitarian tendencies in doctrine and renewing their emphasis on institutional discipline within an enlarged circle of oligarchic control. Baptists could be expected to emphasize a greater measure of democracy because of their autonomous congregations. But in the face of unlicensed preachers, charges of personal misconduct, and disputes within or between local churches, the Philadelphia Baptist Association depended on a British pattern of denominational order, one which placed control of ministerial standards in the hands of clergy. Presbyterians began work in the valley later, and not unexpectedly the Presbytery of Philadelphia emphasized broad lines of corporate authority after its founding in 1706. Here too Butler shows that subsequent discussions of doctrinal uniformity and procedures for ordaining new ministers led to an increased reliance on general clerical control. Shifting gears, the author considers Anglicans too—missionaries supported by the SPG as well as priests located in scattered parishes—because they substantiate his hypothesis negatively. They failed to secure a bishop or other hierarchical structure to maintain parochial discipline; hence their diffuse efforts languished for lack of administrative control. In four test cases Butler found no evidence for democracy in congregations, revivalism in pulpits, or humanistic sympathies in theology.

While appreciating the main contribution of this painstaking study, some readers might wish to enter a mild demurrer, viz., his definition of democracy is rather narrow. Early in his writing (p. 7) Butler states that the issue is fundamentally one of clergymen versus laity. “What rightly determines denominational democracy in both England and America is not whether a clerical leadership existed in them, but whether laymen ultimately selected, shaped and controlled that leadership.” Democracy for him would appear if laymen alone could determine who entered the ministry, choose which ministers could enunciate denominational policy, and thus ascribe limits to clerical authority. Such a definition is admittedly one way of considering the matter, but other questions seem to emerge, and in those instances Butler’s test pattern will not provide much help. One could wish for information regarding possible increases in the advisory role played by laymen. If ministers still made the final decisions, were they steadily more attentive to lay opinion? The author’s argument about George Keith is especially tortured here because, in fact, he shows the final result to be an expansion of the Quaker power base to include secular leadership. Then too, if ministers were almost always the final authority, new standards were actually in operation for persons to become ministers, and this too might be considered a move in the direction of more democracy. Clerical prestige was still high, but qualifications for entry into
that vocation were often lowered to include what some would call men of popular standing. If "tyrant" and "mob" are removed as polarities of the spectrum, then degrees of democratic participation lie everywhere between them, and readers need discerning treatment of varying democratic tendencies throughout that uncharted expanse.

These reservations notwithstanding, the author has performed an admirable task within the limits he set for himself and apprises readers from the outset. Hard work amid primary source materials has clarified one portion of an important theme, and Butler has done it in a definitive manner.

Rutgers University
Douglass College

HENRY WARNER BOWDEN


In 1940 Edward P. Cheyney published his history of the University of Pennsylvania as a part of its bicentennial commemoration. In conjunction with the nation's bicentennial, Martin Meyerson and Dilys Pegler Winegrad published Gladly Learn and Gladly Teach, a more selective treatise on the University's past. The Cheyney volume emphasizes and analyzes the institution's role in society while the more recent publication uses the past as a prologue to the University's destiny. Organized around "portraits of scholars and leaders" and authored by the University's president and his executive assistant, Gladly Learn and Gladly Teach is designed to stimulate interest in and support for the University's future.

Although it details the more dramatic contributions of particular leaders—from the institution's founder, Benjamin Franklin, to Pulitzer Prize-winning historian, Roy F. Nichols—this Meyerson-Winegrad volume cannot be dismissed as a superficial public relations release. It is a thoroughly documented work that examines a provocative subject matter. As one of only eight pre-Revolutionary colleges in English America, the University of Pennsylvania could naturally assume a leadership role, but more importantly, as the authors demonstrate, it possessed the talent to capitalize on this position and to record an impressive list of accomplishments in higher education. This was the first institution, for example, to challenge the completeness of a classical education. From the outset, largely through Franklin's initiative, English enjoyed a prominence over Latin in the curriculum; other modern languages, general history, geography, and scientific topics were also taught as supplements to traditional learning.

The history component of this volume is handled in one brilliant chapter entitled "Roy F. Nichols: Historian and Scholar" that analyzes Nichols's understanding of biography, local history, and the behavioral sciences. By identifying biography as an excellent means for studying the complexities of human behavior, he established its worth and gave it a new
dignity; by interpreting local history as the study of community behavior, he portrayed it as a microcosm of the larger society. He also recognized that the task of explaining human motivation and community behavior required more sophisticated research tools than the mere description that characterized much of the writing of biography and local history prior to his time. This caused him to explore methodologies outside history, and subsequently he was among the first to relate history to the behavioral sciences.

A true exemplar of the University's founder, Nichols effectively combined theory with practical application. Recognizing that no organization devoted specifically to the study of the state's history existed in Pennsylvania, he helped to found the Pennsylvania Historical Association in 1932. He further advanced the understanding of state and local politics by directing a series of doctoral dissertations that traced political interactions within Pennsylvania to 1877. He also converted his interdisciplinary ideas into action while serving on the board of the Social Science Research Council for twenty-two years.

As the first non-sectarian college founded in America, the University of Pennsylvania was able to provide leadership in many fields other than history—e.g., medicine, chemistry, law, business, mathematics, architecture, and archaeology—with the advances in medicine probably the most dramatic. Instrumental in changing medical training from a protracted apprenticeship to a classroom-laboratory experience, the University subsequently appointed the first professor of medicine, opened the first medical school in America, and built the first hospital in the United States to be owned and operated by a university. Closely allied to these innovations was the establishment of the first chair in chemistry in colonial America, a position held by Benjamin Rush, who published the first American treatise in chemistry.

Through their "cast of characters," the authors note many other scientific and educational milestones in which the University can justly take pride, but the final product does not strike a balance between "gladly learn" and "gladly teach." Their emphasis is preponderately on the discovery of knowledge, not on the imparting of knowledge. Since increasing attention is currently being focused on good teaching, perhaps the authors should have tried to redress the imbalance that exists in their work, but admittedly good teaching is not a subject readily reduced to words on a printed page.

University of Pittsburgh
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