Book Reviews


Readers of Pennsylvania History will no doubt recognize the name Edwin Wolf II. Now Librarian Emeritus, he was responsible for the revitalization of the Library Company of Philadelphia, that venerable institution founded by Franklin in 1731. It was Wolf who supervised the move from Broad and Christian streets to the modern building on Locust Street adjacent to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. When Wolf was appointed Librarian in 1955 he began writing the Annual Reports that many readers of this journal may remember with fondness or, perhaps, still cherish. If the founder Franklin could have read these Reports, he would have remarked that Wolf writes for the reader's pleasure and profit. This is true of the Dinosaurus Bibliothecarius's (as Wolf refers to himself) newest work in Philadelphia book history.

The Book Culture of a Colonial American City is an expanded version of the five Lyell Lectures in Bibliography that Wolf delivered at Oxford in 1986. Having consulted newspaper advertisements, inventories, library catalogues, booksellers' broadsides and pamphlets, and correspondence, such as that between booksellers Benjamin Franklin and David Hall and their London supplier William Straham, Wolf's book is much more than an update of Frederick Tolles's chapters in Meeting House and Counting House, "The Taste for Books" and "Reading for Delight and Profit." Wolf goes beyond Tolles's Quaker emphasis. Wolf offers to us in succinct fashion the fruits of decades of study of Philadelphia books and bookmen. He claims that his findings regarding Philadelphia are valid for the other major colonial cities. He does not, however, draw broad conclusions from the information he has amassed. "The historical significance of the books . . .", Wolf writes, "and a socio-economic study of the readership I leave to others." (p. vii)

Nonetheless, in five chapters, Wolf tells us much of significance about book markets, pricing, binding, patterns of ownership and inheritance, readership, libraries, printing, publishing, and selling in eighteenth-century Philadelphia. Chapter one, "Sundry Printed Books," provides background for the following four chapters organized according to the categories of religious and school texts; books in history, politics, government, and biography; law books; and belles-lettres. In the first chapter, Wolf talks of the expansion of the book trade during the first half of the eighteenth-century. He says that "most of the popular books in all fields . . ." were "imported until after the Revolution." (p. 4) He notes that "a book was approximately the monetary equal of half an acre of land." (p. 8) Here Wolf describes the first large importations of books and the holdings of the first substantial libraries.

Rich indeed is this book in book-lore, if not in larger cultural interpretation. In chapter two, "Books for Large People and Small," Wolf notes that "since the vast majority of books bought by the American booksellers from abroad were the same
titles, the competitive edge depended on the source of supply." (p. 56) "Franklin," Wolf says, "worried about competition. He wrote Strahan in February 1745 that he was sending a list of Books he wanted 'which I doubt not you will procure as cheap as possible; otherwise I shall not be able to sell them...." (p. 56)

Chapter three, "They Lived History," and chapter four, "Lawyers and Law Books," describe the many books that Philadelphians owned in these fields. If James Logan had the finest overall library in colonial America, then, Wolf postulates, perhaps Benjamin Chew had the finest law library. Both of these libraries survive: Logan's at the Library Company and Chew's still "in the bookcase at Cliveden." (p. 144) So widely read was the law that in 1771-2 Philadelphia printer Robert Bell printed and sold more than 1,500 sets of Blackstone's Commentaries.

Wolf's final chapter, "We are a kind of Posterity in respect to them," describes the literary tastes of eighteenth-century Philadelphians. "In the early part of the eighteenth-century," according to Wolf, "essays, poetry, and drama dominated the choice of literary works; by the time of the Revolution novels were à la mode." (p. 165) Especially interesting here is the fact that while Philadelphians read Shakespeare, Addison and Steele, Dryden, Pope, and Swift, they did not read Chaucer or Donne. They also read Young, Thomson, and Fénelon. We don't. So much for an objective test of time. Our eighteenth-century is not theirs; theirs, not ours. Wolf reminds readers "that 'Revolution' in the eighteenth-century vocabulary meant merely a change of government." (p. 109) Wolf's accurate and thorough descriptive study, the work of decades, will make for better interpretive work by other scholars to follow. Students take note: "No detailed study of Thomas Bradford's lending library has been made, although the records of books, borrowers, and fees for 1771-2 have been preserved at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania." (p. 195)

If you remember fondly Wolf's Annual Reports, if you read with pleasure Wolf's other works in Philadelphia history, if you enjoyed the many exhibits he curated, or if you want to know what books were available in eighteenth-century Philadelphia and who owned them, read The Book Culture of a Colonial American City. May the species, Dinosaurus Bibliothecarius, prosper.

Dennis Barone, Saint Joseph College


A Mighty Empire expands the idea first developed by Egnal in his "The Origins of the Revolution in Virginia: A Reinterpretation" which appeared in the William and Mary Quarterly in July 1980 (Third Series, Vol. XXXVII, No. 3, pp. 401-428). There he concluded that "in Virginia (and in the other provinces) the Revolutionary movement was led by an upper-class, expansion-minded faction whose views coalesced before 1763 and whose convictions strengthened during the depression that followed the French and Indian War" (p. 403). The book uses almost the same words. Egnal begins the preface
with the assertion "that in every colony the revolutionary movement was led by an upper-class faction whose passionate commitment to the rise of the New World was well evident before 1763" (p. xi). He reiterates what he wrote earlier about Virginia and adds detailed coverage of Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania and South Carolina. Egnal suggests, but doesn’t insist, that the “paradigm” he calls “a new interpretation of the origins of the American Revolution” (p. xi) applies as well to the eight colonies not systematically treated.

Readers attracted to historical models and monocausal explanations may find much to praise in *A Mighty Empire*. Egnal has organized his argument with immense care. He starts with a “Note on Definitions” which spells out precisely what he does and doesn’t mean when he uses the key words in the text—party, faction, expansionism, expansionist and non-expansionist. Next comes an introduction which refines the argument abruptly given in the preface. Part One includes chapters which, north to south, describe the emergence of expansionist and nonexpansionist factions in the five colonies before 1763. Part Two describes the depression of the 1760s, then proceeds much like Part One, but through the years 1763-1770. After a single chapter Part Three on “The Quiet Years” of 1771-1773, Egnal concludes by having “The Expansionists Prevail” between 1774 and 1776. The bulk of each chapter describes the political activities of factions, although most end with a brief discussion of what specific individuals wrote about the future of America. He also provides enough visual aids to convince readers he’s done his homework. There are ten separate maps, full lists of faction members with information on specific votes, and a variety of economic statistics. Egnal’s approach combines the intellectual strategies of both social scientists and lawyers. He hypothesizes with clarity. He prosecutes aggressively.

Unfortunately, he has a very bad case. *The Mighty Empire* is certain to evoke far more criticism than praise. And it deserves the criticism. Egnal’s fundamental idea is hardly “new” and it doesn’t provide much of an explanation—assuming that’s what interpretations are supposed to provide—of why individuals and groups acted as they did. The correlation between expansionist thought and radicalism in the prerevolutionary years may have been strong in Virginia, but few will be convinced by Egnal’s effort to make the claim with equal effectiveness for other colonies. After all, there was only one Northern Neck and one Ohio Company. Perhaps the most striking limitation of the volume is its very conception. Eighteenth century colonial politics were far too complex and idiosyncratic to make it worth any historian’s while to try and divide folks into two or three neat clumps. Egnal simplifies to the point of irrelevance.

Historians announcing new interpretations exhibit an admirable hutzpah; they also invite reviewers to question the freshness and utility of their supposed discoveries. I’ve been teaching a course on the American Revolution for nearly twenty years and have always emphasized the importance of expansionist sentiment in stimulating anti-imperial sentiment. I don’t know any specialist in the revolution who would seriously question the idea, nor any colonialist who denies that eighteenth century politics were shaped in
part by differing attitudes toward expansion into the interior. What Egnal argues, then, lacks freshness.

It also lacks much vitality as explanation. Part of the problem lies in the classic social science debate over the relationship between correlation and causation. Egnal all but assumes that the former constitutes the latter. An individual who, for example, voted for defense of Pennsylvania's frontier in the 50s and later supported independence, therefore became a revolutionist because he believed in expansionism. The person's constitutional beliefs, kinship ties, occupational place within the imperial system, religion, etc. don't matter in Egnal's overall "interpretation" except when they correlate with his factional identification. Moreover, the very concept of expansion doesn't lend itself to the kind of technical measurement that would clearly distinguish those for it from those against it. Egnal struggles throughout the volume to document a clear difference. In the case of New York, for example, he can make no better contrast than the observation that "nonexpansionists limned a more narrowly circumscribed vision of America's future" (p. 67). They gave only "lukewarm" support to the expansionist goal of retaining Canada. The difference between warm and lukewarm doesn't excite much as an interpretation of the Revolution's origins.

An additional basic problem is generalizing from the experience of Virginia. Throughout Egnal creates the impression of having decided what to argue before looking closely at what happened. The colony I know the most about is New Hampshire, one of the eight he writes is "likely" to fit the paradigm. Nothing could be further from the truth: the colony's most ardent expansionists were members of the Wentworth oligarchy, the very people who fought tooth and nail against independence. Strained logic mars the chapters on the four colonies other than Virginia that he does analyze. He has an especially tough time with Pennsylvania. Franklin baffles him because impassioned expansionism and cooperation with Quakers don't fit together in the model. The rich dynamics of political maneuvering in the 60s only seem to irritate him. His solution is a simple one. "The expansionists," he writes, "were variously known as the Proprietary faction, the Court party, New Ticket, or Presbyterian party . . ." (p. 191). Readers will want to turn elsewhere to find out what radicalized Pennsylvanians.

My final criticism is historiographical. The progressives created a historical world polarized by class. Egnal attacks the progressive model of the revolution by insisting the upper class itself was divided, and only expansionists became whigs. Yet he never questions the progressive assumption that the way to understand the revolution is to identify two conflicting factions or parties whose existence predated revolution, and whose relative power shifted dramatically between 1763 and 1776. Egnal only relabels the parties. In the world created by Carl Becker, Charles Beard, and (in Pennsylvania) Charles H. Lincoln, he replaces the conservatives with nonexpansionists and the radicals with expansionists. In this sense A Mighty Empire represents a step backward, not forward, in our understanding of the American Revolution.

Jere Daniell, Dartmouth College


This work is a comparative analysis of the American and French Revolutions. Higonnet approaches the study of revolutionary America and France in light of pertinent political, social, economic, and cultural issues. The author, moreover, develops suggestive theses concerning the mentalities of revolutionary republicanism in America and in France. Higonnet argues that republican ideologies in America led to the creation of a viable federal state with a productive capitalistic economy and that those in France ultimately failed and culminated in the violence of the Jacobins and in the despotic regime of Napoleon. In eight topically arranged chapters, the book reveals how the impact of republican ideologies and institutions differed greatly in both nations.

Higonnet examines American and French political cultures, economies, classes, and cultural institutions. The book contains three chapters about colonial and revolutionary America; Higonnet, who primarily devotes attention to life and institutions in Massachusetts and in Virginia, argues that colonial Americans repudiated the institutions and traditions of European feudalism, developed a strong sense of community, and as advocates of liberalism and capitalism endorsed the doctrine of individualism. The author cites the Puritans as being exemplars of individualism, for they significantly contributed to the development of merchant life, of capitalism, and of republican institutions in colonial America. Higonnet, unfortunately, does not attempt to demonstrate how these patterns were applicable to Pennsylvania. The author's account of the origins and the major activities of the American Revolution is quite extensive. Like Bailyn and Pocock, Higonnet stresses republican ideologies as being a major cause of the American Revolution: leaders of this revolution are perceived as paragons of "virtue," utilizing a new "language of revolution" to vindicate their cause against the British and advocating the creation of a republican state and the recognition of natural liberties. The book contains an adequate discussion of significant events, leaders, and symbols of the American Revolution; Higonnet, however, fails to recognize the importance of conservative merchant elites during the last years of the revolution and to treat major economic and political issues arising during the Confederation era.

The study contains three lengthy chapters about the French Revolution. Higonnet maintains that economic and social deterioration and political demise characterized prerevolutionary France: the decline of the guilds, the limited penetration of capitalistic ideas among aristocratic and middle class elites, the immense economic and tax problems of the peasantry, the failure of the reform programs of royal advisors, and the limited spread of Enlightenment doctrines led to the collapse of the ancien régime. The author explains how aristocratic and middle class elites espousing moderate republican ideologies failed to implement their policies and programs during the National Assembly era and how Jacobin leaders, through their collectivistic program, imposed...
violence and terror on France. There is also a vivid account of the ritualism and symbols of a French civil religion during the radical years of the revolution. In the epilogue, Higonnet concludes that collectivism, bureaucratic centralism, and violence were a reflection of the destructive qualities of the French Revolution and that liberalism, federalism, and capitalism were a reflection of the constructive features of the American Revolution.

Despite several weaknesses, this book has much to recommend it. Higonnet's study reflects extensive research, is well footnoted, and contains a comprehensive bibliography. Although lucidly written, this work suffers from organizational problems and is repetitious in places. The author, too, might have suggested why republican doctrines were important to cultural institutions and to the working classes in colonial and revolutionary America. Nevertheless, this work reveals the validity of the views of Shaw and Hunt about rhetoric and symbolism in revolutionary America and France and helps to corroborate the thinking of Palmer and Godechot about republican mentalities during the Atlantic revolutions of the eighteenth century.

R. William Weisberger, Butler County Community College


The writing of state history is no longer the exclusive purview of filiopietists, antiquarians, and well-intentioned amateurs. Using the historical resources now readily available and often conveniently catalogued, professional historians have discovered the rewards of researching the large and heretofore under-utilized historical manuscripts, papers, inventories, and documents to be found in local, county, and state historical societies and state archives. For Maryland, this resurgence of interest in the writing of state history has resulted in the publication of at least two readable and comprehensive histories. In 1974 the Maryland Historical Society published the highly acclaimed *Maryland: A History, 1632–1974* edited by Richard Walsh and William Lloyd Fox (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1974). In ten chapters this multi-authored work fulfilled a longstanding need for a readable yet scholarly survey of Maryland's varied and interesting history.

With the publication of Robert Brugger's *Maryland: A Middle Temperament, 1634–1980,* there is now available a single-authored, readable, comprehensive history of The Old Line State from its beginnings in the 1630s under the benevolent leadership of Cecil Calvert (the second Lord Baltimore) to the opening of Baltimore's "Harborplace" in July 1980.

As portrayed in this lengthy survey, Maryland's history is United States history in microcosm. Among the topics covered are Indian-white relations, black slavery, representative government, tobacco economy, American independence, sectionalism,
Civil war, emancipation, immigration, urbanization, industrialization, civil rights, and suburbanization. Within a chronological framework, the author weaves these topics into a narrative which is informative, interesting, and plausible. The result is the best single-volume available on Maryland history.

Somewhat less plausible, however, is Brugger’s attempt to impose the central theme of *A Middle Temperament* on the 350-year-history of a state as diverse and varied as Maryland. It is true that Maryland is a border state being neither entirely southern or northern in outlook, that it embraces a wide variety of geographic and climatic areas, that it had slave and non-slave regions, that it is rural, suburban, and urban, and that it often was able to avoid the extremes associated with other states. However, human history is far too complex to be explained in this way. Having said the above, it must be said further that Brugger’s attempt to set forth a general theme or interpretation for all of Maryland history is certainly thought-provoking, but not necessarily convincing.

Interpretation aside, Brugger does offer an interesting story. Included in his narrative are vivid and historically sound accounts of the 17th century founding of this New World “haven for Roman Catholics,” the emergence of a tobacco economy making “necessary” the introduction of black slavery, the late 18th century revolutionary movement and the emergence of Maryland as an independent state, the development in the 19th century of a more diversified economy, the tragedy of Civil War (which affected “America’s oldest border state” with particular severity), the emancipation of Maryland’s large slave population, the urbanization and industrialization of the late 19th century and early 20th century, and the suburbanization of the post-World War II era.

Interspersed among the accounts of war and peace, western expansion and urbanization, the traditional and the innovative are descriptions of many of the more important, colorful, and in some cases most outrageous persons who have played parts in Maryland’s unique history. Thus such diverse personalities as Spiro T. Agnew, Montgomery Blair, Jonathan Boucher, Harry C. ”Curley” Byrd, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Samuel Chase, Thomas A. D’Alesandro, Jr., Frederick Douglass, Arthur Pue Gorman, Thomas Hicks, Reverdy Johnson, John Pendleton Kennedy, Francis Scott Key, Theodore McKeldin, Luther Martin, Henry L. Mencken, William Paca, Albert C. Ritchie, George Herman ”Babe” Ruth, Samuel Smith, Roger B. Taney, and Millard E. Tydings are paraded appropriately through the pages of what is in many ways a social history of the “land of pleasant living.”

Brugger’s history should appeal to a wide audience. For those who want a readable, but not overly scholarly narrative, the twelve chronologically arranged chapters cover well the most important events, movements, and people. On the other hand, scholars will find useful the extensive endnotes and the fifty-eight-page bibliographical essay. This comprehensive essay includes both primary and secondary sources and would be an excellent starting-point for anyone wishing to delve into Maryland’s historical past regardless of the level of sophistication. Also of merit is the author’s inclusion of numerous useful maps, charts, tables, and illustrations and a sixteen-page chronology.
Thus Professor Bruger has fulfilled the need for a single-authored (and therefore coherent), comprehensive, engagingly written survey of Maryland history which should serve as the definitive Maryland state history for the foreseeable future.

Joseph C. Morton, *Northeastern Illinois University*


This volume is part of Garland's "Outstanding Studies in Early American History" series edited by John Murrin. The purpose of this series is to make more readily accessible worthy doctoral dissertations. Arnold's work, a 1976 Princeton dissertation written under the direction of Murrin and originally entitled, "Political Ideology and the Internal Revolution in Pennsylvania, 1776-1790," has long been familiar to scholars of the Revolution, and frequently is cited in current works. It appears here unrevised, its notes and bibliography frozen in 1976.

The choice of Arnold's dissertation for this series is a good one. His is a thoughtful and well-written work. Inspired by Gordon Wood's *The Creation of the American Republic* (1969), Arnold's study examines the ideological dimension of the political, social, and economic struggles in Pennsylvania in the nearly two decades after independence. Like Wood's work (and others' since) Arnold assigns ideas, particularly the cluster of values and assumptions which have become identified as "republican," an independent role in revolutionary Pennsylvania. He seeks to tie those ideas into specific socio-economic group interests.

Arnold argues that between 1776 and 1790 Pennsylvania experienced a "revolution of American conservatism" not unlike that described on a national level in David H. Fischer's, *The Revolution of American Conservatism: The Federalist Party in the Era of Jeffersonian Democracy* (1965). The political upheaval of 1776 triggered in Pennsylvania "an internal revolution unmatched anywhere else in America" (17). The Pennsylvania constitution of that year shattered the old political culture and remained at the center of subsequent controversies as Pennsylvanians divided over new political solutions. From this contest arose two ideological parties. Though they shared common Whig assumptions and attitudes about power, liberty and virtue, and though they embraced a common language and style, each emphasized different aspects of their ideological heritage. Defenders of the Constitution—the Constitutionalists—accentuated the homogeneity of the Pennsylvania population, the virtue of an independent electorate, direct deference by all governmental agencies to the popular will, and individual commitment to the new, independent order. Their opponents—the Republicans—placed greater stress on governmental balance, the rule of law, and checks on majorities.

Each began with a Philadelphia core group of roughly similar age, political experience, and occupations, although the Constitutionalists represented newer wealth
and status. Through greater flexibility and adroitness Republicans attracted additional constituencies, enabling them by the late 1780's to defeat their rivals and to oversee the state's ratification of the new federal constitution and the writing of the state constitution of 1790. Both documents embodied long-held Republican ideals.

The irony, as Arnold points out, is that the Constitutionals who purported to represent the will of the people became increasingly exclusive and intolerant in their positions in an effort to carry its way, and, over time, appealed to a narrower and narrower constituency, while their more conservative opponents pursued a program of tolerance and inclusiveness which ultimately earned them a more popular following. Arnold's primary fascination clearly is with the Republicans who exhibited consummate skill in holding on to elitist ideas and managing electoral victories in a society rapidly embracing democratic ideas, rhetoric, and practices.

With considerable sophistication, Arnold traces the conflicts between these two groups as they confronted questions regarding the treatment of Tories, revision of the constitution of 1776, economic and financial reforms, the role and basis of the College of Philadelphia, and the new federal constitution. Despite periodic shifts in personnel and issues in each party over time, Arnold is impressed with the consistency of their ideological arguments and goals. The emergence of the Republicans was slow and hotly contested; Arnold rejects the idea put forth by Robert Brunhouse and others that Republican dominance by 1790 represented a "counter-revolution."

Arnold's book suffers both from original weaknesses and omissions, and from its now being dated. To his credit, Arnold understands many of his work's original limitations, such as its failure to pay sufficient attention to the impact of liberal ideas, its short-changing of the Constitutionals and their constituencies, and its slighting of class and social strains. He addresses these shortcomings briefly in a new introduction. There he also notes some of the more important studies which have appeared since 1976 and suggests how, in light of them, he might rewrite his dissertation if he were to revise it today.

The hefty price attached to this volume seems incompatible with the series' goal of making such works more readily available. Many scholars doubtless will be content to rely on hard or soft copies from University Microfilms.

G.S. Rowe, University of Northern Colorado


In this slender volume, John R. Nelson offers a coherent revisionist interpretation of early national politics. The most striking conclusions center upon the issue of industrialization; Alexander Hamilton was not its champion nor was the Republican triumvirate (Jefferson, Madison, and Gallatin) its opponent. These proclivities followed
logically from divergent conceptions of political economy. But even here the nature of their division has been misunderstood: Federalists and Republicans agreed as to the ultimate purpose of political society and to the efficacy of federal power in achieving that end. Where they disagreed was over those policies and programs most likely to ensure stability.

The primary contribution of the author lies in his ability to translate political ideology into practical politics. Using the abundant written records left by Alexander Hamilton and Albert Gallatin, Nelson contrasts “their world views, the interest groups within their political constituencies, and the historical context in which world view and interest interacted.” (p. xi) For Alexander Hamilton, the challenge was to surmount the weaknesses of the Constitution by creating a strong national government that enlisted the allegiance of wealthy creditors. But to gain this support, Hamilton had to whittle down the national debt, no mean accomplishment in a period of budget deficits. He needed the flow of tariff revenues, drawn largely from American importation of British manufactures. This not only explains his reprehensible behavior during the negotiation of the Jay Treaty, but also his lukewarm support of manufactures. Hamilton dallied in his drafting of the famous Report on Manufactures, and the Report represented a clear retreat from the budget busting proposals set forth by his assistant secretary, Tench Coxe, in an earlier draft. Hamilton’s Report sought merely to promote the Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures, which because of its funding provisions would boost the market for government securities.

If Hamilton threatened to sacrifice the nation’s independence, the Republican triumvirate sought to restore it. Following the lead of Joyce Appleby, Nelson envisions Jefferson as the proponent of growth through economic opportunity. His Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin, actively worked for an enlarged federal role with his plans for government funded projects in transportation, banking, and education as well as direct loans to manufacturers. In contrast to Hamilton’s dependence upon an elite, the Republican triumvirate relied upon all propertied citizens united in a national market. This market, particularly with a self-sustaining manufacturing sector, could wean the nation from a reliance upon foreign commerce and foreign goods. Even though fiscal restraints emasculated Gallatin’s program, Republicans benefited to a hitherto unappreciated degree from the support of manufacturers and mechanics.

This new interpretative framework has much to recommend it. Most notably, it weaves together a number of issues to fashion a consistent argument. The author’s insistence upon placing world views in specific historical context not only permits a reevaluation of conventional wisdom, it also forces us to recognize the policy priorities of the time. But consistency and an imaginative concept of political economy do not constitute proof. As the author acknowledges, his assertions invite further scrutiny. To what extent could Gallatin speak for Republicans and particularly their leader, Thomas Jefferson? Will empirical measurements support his assumptions about the political allegiances of the various interest groups? And while the author eschews simple economic determinism, what operational definition would he offer for an interest
group? The author incorporates some discussion of the changing international economic environment during this era, but he shies from careful analysis. An appendix includes fifteen first rate graphs of economic statistics; one wishes that they had been incorporated more fully into the narrative. Occasionally the author errs in economic logic, for example, asserting that land abundance resulted in plentiful foodstuffs that in turn reduced labor costs. Few economic historians would posit a subsistence wage for free men even in these formative decades.

Liberty and Property merits a wide readership. The author displays a command not only of the primary source material churned out by his political elite, but also of the burgeoning secondary literature on the early national period. His interpretation extends and supports other recent work on our early political economy. Perhaps the time has come to discard our stereotypes of Hamilton as the proponent of nationalism and industrialism and of Jefferson (or perhaps more accurately of Republicans) as the advocate of laissez-faire agrarianism.

Diane Lindstrom, University of Wisconsin-Madison


This book casts the significance of the War of 1812 more broadly than any previous work by a historian, and thereby recovers the war from the historiographical backwater where it has languished throughout this century. It also makes a major contribution to the literature hypothesizing what Steven Watts terms a "massive, multifaceted transformation away from republican traditions and toward modern liberal capitalism in America." It is the author's contention that the War of 1812 played a "crucial role in this crystallizing process by energizing and validating larger liberalizing impulses"; and that a group of literary figures—some of whom were also politicians, ministers, and/or economic theorists—"took the lead in advancing liberal ideas and in sanctifying them in war" (p. xvii). Watts's methods and logic are those of the cultural historian; and he adopts, in part, a prosopographical approach to illustrate this transformation through the lives and words of a number of key cultural figures. The presentation works, and the focus on individuals adds both a human face and subtle nuances to the sweeping subject-matter of the book.

The problem is that the eighteenth century which Watts uses as the foundation for his edifice of change never existed. The revolution that he describes was a long-term process that was not born in the 1790s. For example, to support his dubious claim to a market revolution accompanied by deep cultural change, Watts drags the old myth of the death of deference out of the historiographical trash-heap where it belongs. Scottish
tobacco merchants, among others, in the mid-eighteenth century abhorred the same “spirit of independence” among Americans that Watts thinks is new to a Scottish traveler’s account at the beginning of the next century. The observations of antebellum visitors do tell us something about the cultural differences between European and American societies at the time, but they do not necessarily speak to change in America over time as Watts would have us believe.

Likewise, Watts ignores the merchant entrepreneurs who transformed America’s seacoast cities in the early eighteenth century by introducing a bewildering array of commodities that consumers quickly decided they could not live without. According to this model, the likes of George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and Thomas Paine, among many others, were before rather than of their times. There is only one reference in the index, and two in the book, to Benjamin Franklin, that great prophet of entrepreneurship, who died as the 1790s began; and there is not a single reference to the Franklin of the Autobiography, who expressed so many of the cultural truisms that appealed to liberal capitalists in the nineteenth century. And what are we to make of such seventeenth-century Americans as Thomas Keayne, or such eighteenth-century figures as Samuel Sewall and Samuel Colton, who each in his own way, and in his own time, confronted dramatic changes in the marketplace and was personally torn by the changes in ethics, community standards, and expanding opportunities associated with economic growth; who each profitted from and agonized over the changes in the world around him? Were these men’s lives any less culturally revealing, any more “exceptional,” than those selected by Watts as spokesmen for a later age? Who is to say, how are we to judge, how can we know when the questions are not even asked?

The language of purification, renewal, and rebirth that Watts finds in justifications for the War of 1812 are certainly fascinating; they do, as he says, speak to the role of war “in the development of western society (p. xviii).” But they do not, unless in specific comparison, tell us what is distinctive about American society at that time. The very language is drawn, as Watts seems to know, from the Revolutionary era, where the non-importation movement was based on a similar, if not identical, discomfort with the temptations of manufactured goods. Similar, or perhaps identical, breast-beating was also part of the justificatory language associated with the Seven Years War in America. Perhaps Watts is correct that there is change reflected in this continuous theme, but demonstration of the point will await comparative study over time. And what are we to make of the fact that during the era of the War of 1812, as well as in the half-century preceding it, Native American purification movements such as the Ghost Dance phenomenon, and calls to war against Euro-Americans, were cast in the same sorts of questioning of participation in the market, that peoples of radically different cultural traditions experienced similar kinds of tensions and proposed identical solutions to those that Watts finds in the language of his cultural exemplars of white America? What the author has identified here is such a fundamental theme in western calls for war, in the present as well as the past, that it is difficult to credit claims to singularity, to newness, to
meanings within time, place, and culture, unless there is comparison at least to what came before the culture was "transformed."

None of this vitiates the contributions of a book that is very gracefully written, offers at times brilliant and always provocative and suggestive insights to the culture of the Early Republic, and which—as the best books do—raises more questions than it provides answers about the grand themes that it treats. The Republic Reborn is not only an important book, but a good one, and a book that is a joy to read.

Thomas P. Slaughter, Rutgers University


(Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989. Pp. x, 284. $32.50.)

Republicanism and millennialism, Kenneth Winn argues, were the principal sources of the Mormon conflict with Jacksonian America. In Winn's view, both the Mormons and their neighbors agreed that republicanism undergirded the American nation, but they differed in interpreting the concept.

For most Americans, republicanism had become essentially individualistic and democratic. Mormons, in Winn's view, harkened to the drum beat of an older communitarian republicanism. For Winn, in perhaps a different sense than Emerson meant the term, Mormonism was truly an afterclap of Puritanism. Latter-day Saints believed in community solidarity under prophetic leadership to which the individual gave his voluntary assent. Most Americans believed that individual autonomy was the cornerstone of republicanism. Both understandings of republicanism—individualistic and communitarian—were quite legitimate, but also mutually incompatible.

Unfortunately, the Mormons' view of republicanism was so far out of date by the third decade of the nineteenth century that the two communities found it impossible to live peacefully together. In arguing this point, Winn rehearses the history of the Mormon relationships with the larger American society in New York, Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. In each case, while the details of the story were different, the results were the same. Since the Mormons constituted a minority, and since their community conflicted with and seemed to threaten the larger gentile community, they had to leave. Eventually, the Saints had concluded that the United States was so corrupt that they fled the country not only to save themselves, but in order to preserve a remnant that might save the nation and true republicanism in the bargain.

For a time, Winn argues, Mormons hopefully—if quite reluctantly—accepted the persecution by individualistic republicans because of their deep seated faith in millennialism. As convinced millennialists and Christian primitivists, they fully expected Christ's second coming to save them from oppression. By the 1840s, however, they had concluded that Christ's return lay far in the future. They responded by establishing a
ghost government on earth designed to stand in readiness for the second coming. This served to inflame an already volatile tinder box.

In fashioning his conception of republicanism and millennialism, Winn has relied upon the previous work of a number of scholars. For his views of republicanism, he is indebted to work stretching back to studies by Bernard Bailyn and Gordon Wood (whom he does not cite) and more recent work by Rowland Berthoff (whom he does). For his conception of Mormon millennialism and Christian primitivism, he is indebted to the work of Marvin Hill and Klaus Hansen.

There are a number of problems with Winn’s analysis. First, the book is based almost entirely on published sources. For that reason, it does not show the depth of research that, for instance, Marvin Hill’s Quest for Refuge (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989) demonstrates.

Second, Winn relies on a tradition that stretches back to Alexander Campbell which assumes that Joseph Smith wrote the Book of Mormon. At least two sets of statistical wordprint analyses, both of which demonstrate multiple authorship by writers other than Joseph Smith, make that assumption no longer tenable. These include an older study by a team headed by Alvin C. Rencher at Brigham Young University, and a second by a study-team headed by John L. Hilton at the University of California at Berkeley. While a scholar may—with some confidence—argue that Joseph Smith believed in and learned from the Book of Mormon, it is no longer a valid assumption that he wrote it.

Third, if the author is to use an analytical model based on the concept of republicanism, he ought to explain how such a framework is superior to one based on the concept of building the Kingdom of God, which the Mormons believed they were doing. It may well be that the Mormons held two contradictory ideas in their minds at the same time. If so, how did they do it?

Finally, although the differing interpretations of republicanism were undoubtedly necessary components in the Mormon-gentile conflict, it is not at all certain that such concepts were sufficient to have generated the violence associated with the Mormon experiences in Missouri and Illinois. Another avenue that Winn might have explored was the idea he suggested that the Mormons failed to try “to form a component part of the community” (p. 221). Although people living in the same society may differ in their interpretation of matters as fundamental as the philosophical bases of their polity, they can live together as long as they share a sense of community. Since the Latter-day Saints and their neighbors had virtually no political, social, economic, or religious interests that coincided, conflict was probably inevitable.

On balance, the principal value of Winn’s study is to provide a broad analysis of the Mormon/non-Mormon conflict over the issue of American republicanism. Further study is still needed to place this analysis in the more fundamental context of the sources of the sense of community in the two incompatible societies.

Thomas G. Alexander, Brigham Young University

(Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1989 Pp. xv, 313. $28.95.)

Who was the "real" Reverend Charles Owen Rice? In the first scholarly biography of Pittsburgh's preeminent labor priest, Patrick J. McGeever chronicles the life and work of the controversial cleric. McGeever's task was formidable, for the young "Flophouse Father," World War II superpatriot, and Cold War Red-baiter was a far different man from the draft counselor and anti-war activist of the sixties. What McGeever offers the reader is a chronological narrative which focuses upon Rice's chief interests: social and economic deprivation, the menace posed by totalitarian systems, and the uses of power in a free society.

From his earliest days in the priesthood Rice chose to seek a high public profile. Throughout his life he expressed a veritable blizzard of opinions on every conceivable subject. His penchant for the limelight accounted for the charge that he was an unfulfilled priest, bored by the routine of parish life. McGeever deflects that accusation, and argues that Rice was a man of substance who believed that Christianity dictated action on important issues. McGeever asserts that the Catholic Radical Alliance was a logical vehicle for a man of Rice's convictions.

It was, according to the author, Rice's support for industrial labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations in particular, which first established his public reputation. Rice did a wartime duty as Pittsburgh's rent-control czar and bellicose propagandist, but returned to the labor front after the war. McGeever devotes an entire chapter to Rice the post war Red-baiter. His portrait of Rice is not flattering: a zealot careless with the civil rights of others, an FBI informant, a subverter of union democracy. The author features Rice's crusade to rid the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of communism and reaches a dubious conclusion: Rice's allegations of communism were generally supported by extensive personal research on union affairs. In fact, Rice did shoot from the hip on communism. More disappointing is McGeever's failure to determine the source of Rice's anti-communist zeal, and to explain his decision to recant Red-baiting years later.

The second half of the book is devoted to Rice the born-again radical. An anti-Vietnam War activist and counselor to draft resisters, Rice became the object of FBI surveillance. He also requested and received an assignment to a parish in Homewood, a predominantly black neighborhood. Rice soon emerged as an ally of local black activists such as Bouie Haden. Unfortunately, McGeever says little of Rice's relationship with Mayor David Lawrence and his democratic machine. The reader is left to guess Rice's attitude toward the Lawrence-Mellon plan for the regeneration of Pittsburgh. Even less clear is Rice's perception of the roles of blacks and of the white working-class in the post-industrial Renaissance City. Since McGeever does not appear to have a firm grip on the political pulse of the city, he tends to portray Rice, intentionally or not, as a lonely figure well outside the mainstream of Pittsburgh's urban reform.
Apostle of Contradiction is an important book, and deserves a bibliography. McGeever has scoured the Rice papers, but has neglected potentially important sources such as the Philip Murray papers (Catholic University) and the Steelworkers Collections (Penn State University). The author also has a habit of dropping names such as Casimir Orlemanski (a labor priest senior to Rice) without explanation or identification. Inasmuch as the Rice papers are now available to scholars, it is probable that McGeever's assessment of Rice will be challenged, particularly by labor historians. However that may be, McGeever's study is a valuable addition to a growing body of works devoted to western Pennsylvania history. The book complements other works with reformist themes such as Roy Lubove's Twentieth Century Pittsburgh, and Michael Weber's more recent Don't Call Me Boss.

Carl Meyerhuber, Penn State University—New Kensington


The Amish of Lancaster County live in homes without electricity and do not own automobiles (the preferred method of transportation is horse and buggy). Their distinctive dress sets them apart from tourists who travel to Lancaster County specifically to see "those quaint people." Because most of us know very little about the subtleties of the Amish religion and lifestyle, we often dismiss these American Anabaptists as a nineteenth-century relic. Donald Kraybill's excellent study of this group reminds us that the Lancaster County Amish are very much a part of the present and future of Pennsylvania.

The introduction to The Riddle of Amish Culture notes that the book "...is not intended to be comprehensive" (p. ix). Despite this disclaimer, Kraybill has presented a picture and rationale of Amish life that is rarely experienced by those who are not in close contact with these remarkable people. In his attempt to "...understand the dynamics of Amish society" (p. vii), he has provided a very thorough description of how an important American ethnic and religious group works, lives, and worships.

According to Kraybill, the key to understanding the Amish of Lancaster County (and his study is limited to the traditional Amish of this county) is Gelassenheit, or submission. "...Gelassenheit spells out the individual's subordinate relationship to the larger social order" (p. 25). To understand Gelassenheit is to understand how an Amish businessman could sell his computer after his bishop decreed that computers were not acceptable in the community.

A number of important historical events are chronicled in The Riddle of Amish Culture. An entire chapter, for instance, is devoted to the story of the Amish and public education. Kraybill explains why the Amish do not want their children to attend high
school, and documents the events leading up to a compromise that was acceptable to
both the community and the government. The story is fascinating to read, and will
answer many questions people have about the role of education in Amish life.

A significant portion of the book is devoted to the love/hate relationship the
Amish appear to have with technology. Electricity, of course, is forbidden; yet, batteries
are allowed, and "... generators are permitted for welders, bulk tanks, and power tools
for mobile construction crews" (p. 158). Lack of electricity effectively separates the
Amish from the modern world, however much they interact with that same world during
the course of a day. It is clear that the use of electricity would generate major changes in
the lifestyle of the Amish community.

The author initiates a dialogue between the Amish and the "moderns" who are
puzzled by each other's lifestyles. He notes that the community and the modern world
interact in four ways: concessions by the Amish, concessions to the Amish, negotiated
settlements, and those issues which "... never appeared on the bargaining table" (p. 246).
This strategy has apparently worked, for the Amish are thriving in Lancaster County.

Kraybill concludes his study by wondering if there is not some sort of middle
ground between Gelassenheit and the modern world. Although the question is unanswer-
able, it does leave the reader thinking about some of the issues raised throughout the
book.

_The Riddle of Amish Culture_ should be required reading for anyone interested in the
history of the Amish in Pennsylvania. It is a very readable book, and the author has
managed to include a substantial number of photographs, which should be of interest to
anyone who has not had the chance to experience the presence of the Amish in
Lancaster County. In addition, Kraybill has provided a valuable source of oral history
through his interviews with people who are active members in the Amish community.

Margaret M. McGuiness, _Cabrini College_

---

By Builder Levy. _Images of Appalachian Coalfields._


Builder Levy first appeared in the Appalachian coalfields around two decades ago,
a time of upheaval in the mountains and thus an auspicious time for a documentary
photographer to begin work. The Black Lung Movement was giving way to root-and-
branch union reform as the last great coal boom brought a young and impatient
workforce into the mines. Through Paul Nyden and other activists, the New York
photographer struck up contacts throughout Appalachia and thrust himself into the
action. _Images of Appalachian Coalfields_ represents his view of that critical chapter of
regional history.

Levy's portrait is a broad one. He returned to Appalachia often in the 1970's and
1980's, witnessing milestone events such as the prolonged Harlan County, Kentucky,
strike, as well as the quieter undercurrents of change. The first fruit of his travels was *Life of the Appalachian Coal Miner*, an unbound portfolio published in 1976. His new book shares many images with the earlier work, but expands it into a handsome hardbound collection of about 100 black-and-white photographs.

The pictures are drawn from central and northern Appalachia, West Virginia and Kentucky in particular and western Pennsylvania to a lesser extent. The photographer concerns himself only with the industrial face of the region. His is a grim view of an industry settling into decline, at least as regards its ability to provide employment, and this colors his overall portrayal. He would have found a different picture in non-industrial Appalachia, the dozens of counties which have never experienced the decidedly mixed blessing of coal mining.

In turning his camera toward the social problems of the mountains, Levy joins many predecessors who have prospected in what surely must be the most photographed region of the country. The tradition found its most masterful expression in the work of Walker Evans, Russell Lee and other photographers of the New Deal era, and with Doris Ullman somewhat before that. Another wave of itinerant photographers washed up with the poverty war, and the region itself has produced generations of homegrown photographers—Earl Palmer, William "Pictureman" Mullins and others—whose work is only now coming to light.

Levy stands somewhere in the upper half of this crowded field. His work is technically very good, and it has received respectful treatment by Temple University Press. The fine printing—done in Hong Kong, alas—and the paper and binding will ensure his book's survival beyond that of other recent collections produced in oversized softbound editions.

Still, Appalachian social conditions have been documented many times, and in this regard there is not much new that Levy can show us. From a strictly documentary standpoint, his opening section of photographs of miners at work is of greatest value. Most photographers who troop through the coalfields never make it underground, and very few have spent the time there that Builder Levy has. His work in this regard is reminiscent of Earl Dotter and a few others of the union reform era, and only *The American Coal Miner* (President's Commission on Coal, Washington, D.C., 1980) from the Rockefeller Coal Commission brought together more good working scenes in recent years.

Aesthetically, Levy's portraits are his most distinguished work. These pictures—of folk singer Nimrod Workman, among others—are often superb. The closing shot of a barefoot and cross-armed Pennsylvania youngster sitting grimly amid industrial rubble leaves the future entirely open to question, just the point the photographer wishes to make.

Appalachian scholar Helen Matthew Lewis provides a substantial introduction to *Images of Appalachian Coalfields*, grounding Levy's passionate impressions in the hard facts of recent times. Cornell Capa contributes a brief foreword. Capa's observations
about the inexplicable doggedness of documentary photographers are very much to the
point in the case of this work which took 20 years to complete, but we may join him in
gratitude that Builder Levy stuck it out to produce this striking visual record of one
aspect of a long regional saga.

Ken Sullivan, *West Virginia Division of Culture and History*