

By 1710 their efforts came to fruition, as they had created a “workable political identity” and “established Pennsylvania as a firmly Quaker colony” (216). Historical revisionism remained a crucial strategy as Quakers struggled to remain in power, most notably through the pen of David Lloyd, Speaker of the Assembly. This Quaker revisionism would go on to exert tremendous influence on later histories of Pennsylvania. Dying in 1727, Caleb Pusey left unfinished his “Account,” a manuscript of Pennsylvania history. The manuscript would pass through the hands of several prominent Pennsylvanians before reaching Robert Proud, who wrote the first published history of the commonwealth in 1797–1798. Pusey’s Pennsylvania more resembled the Garden of Eden than the true nascent Pennsylvania, Pusey’s omissions and overwhelming praise of the Quaker founders in his “Account” had a lasting impression that still reaches us today.

While many Pennsylvanians may delight in the mythical origins of the commonwealth, Smolenski brings justice to the founders by bringing out the not-so-divine aspects of creating the province in this masterful work. While *Friends and Strangers* is a study of identity formation in early Pennsylvania, it is also a reflection of larger patterns seen again in colonial British America and throughout the history of the United States. A work like *Friends and Strangers* is long overdue in Pennsylvania historiography and I hope that it will invite others to look further into other long-held historical traditions.

DOUG MACGREGOR

*University of Virginia*

Thomas E. Crocker. *Braddock’s March: How the Man Sent to Seize a Continent Changed American History*. (Yardley, PA: Westholme Publishing, 2009. Pp. xvi, 329. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, \$28.00.)

The defeat of General Edward Braddock on the banks of the Monongahela River in July of 1755 remains one of the most devastating defeats of Anglo-American arms on the continent of North America. It was also entirely unexpected. So confident had Philadelphians been that the city had already prepared a fireworks display in anticipation of Braddock’s certain victory.

The unimaginable defeat has proven so mystifying that modern historians have perpetually sought to comprehend what occurred on that hot July day. Thomas E. Crocker's *Braddock's March: How the Man Sent to Seize a Continent Changed American History* represents a new installment in the franchise. Although the author does tell the story of Braddock's ill-fated endeavor, Crocker's analysis focuses, as the title clearly indicates, on the longer-lasting effects of the campaign.

The story presented in *Braddock's March* will prove quite familiar to many students of colonial America. The usual names, places, and results of Braddock's expedition fill its pages. The author does well to clearly and thoroughly illuminate the little-discussed nature of the general's military "family" and how it consequently strained his relationship with his next-in-commands, colonels Thomas Dunbar and Francis Halkett. What sets Crocker's work apart from more established treatments of Braddock, such as Lee McCardell's biographical sketch in *Ill-Starred General* (1986) and Paul E. Kopperman's detailed evaluation of the source material in *Braddock at the Monongahela* (1973), is the extensive attention paid to the overarching consequences of the defeat. To that end, he identifies major military and political shifts in American history that may be traced back to that fateful day in 1755.

Crocker argues, for example, that among Braddock's army were the junior officers who later developed into the core senior leadership of both America's and Great Britain's Revolutionary War-era armies. The success of men such as George Washington, Thomas Gage, and Arthur St. Clair support his point. Washington, he suggests, managed to redeem his tarnished reputation after his Fort Mifflin debacle by serving with distinction in the battle. The author further suggests that the battle represents the birth of special forces and the first use of rifles in combat. Finally, Crocker sees a noticeable shift in American perceptions of warfare. He believes that the defeat both convinced Americans of the superiority of irregular warfare and forced them to question the invincibility of British arms. To the author, these military transformations either directly led to the American Revolution or shaped how armies conducted that conflict.

Crocker also connects the campaign to political developments. It led to the expulsion of the Acadians, the ultimate annihilation of native peoples, and a shift in British policy toward one aimed at seizing the entirety of Canada. For the colonists, the author further claims, the event represented a major turning point in their relationship with Great Britain. It opened up the first major corridor into the interior of the continent leading to a postwar explosion of

western settlement. The apparent inability of the British to defend the colonies resulted in the development of American self-reliance. Finally, the campaign forced, if only on a micro-level, the colonists and Great Britain to define their relationship within the empire as they negotiated who was responsible for providing funding, provisions, and troops. Once again, Crocker seems to argue that the expedition's political ramifications helped direct a course toward revolution.

In making his case, Crocker suggests that the Braddock campaign rivals, if not exceeds, the most important events during the Seven Years' War. He notes that "[t]he geopolitical reality of a united British North America—from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico—born on the Plains of Abraham [referring here to General James Wolfe's seminal victory at Quebec in 1759] . . . lasted only seventeen years, whereas the uniquely American geopolitical reality launched by Braddock's expedition has lasted over 250" (xv). It is a bold statement to claim that a disastrous defeat, later rectified by General John Forbes in 1758, trumps Wolfe's essentially war-ending victory at Quebec in 1759.

Consequently, some of the author's more radical claims may be considerably questioned. Others prove somewhat standard and have been, in fact, previously proposed by other historians, including Kopperman in *Braddock on the Monongahela*. At the same time, however, many of Crocker's points appear worth serious consideration. Is it too farfetched to imagine that the ignoble defeat, heavily followed by colonial populations through the print media, planted a seed of doubt about British capabilities in the minds of Americans that blossomed into martial confidence during the Revolution? Is it likewise improbable that Braddock's, and by association Great Britain's, imperious demands for colonial funds, property, and soldiers encouraged a questioning of that relationship which later manifested itself in independence? In both cases, a more thorough evaluation of the defeat's effects on colonial opinion may have supported his conjectures.

Ultimately, *Braddock's March* does not provide the reader with a new story of the campaign, and some of its arguments might be too tenuous for comfort while others may be too straightforward. However, the author's overall assessment that the campaign fundamentally altered the relationship between the colonies and Great Britain is worthy of debate and further scholarly inquiry. At the very least, the book does its subject matter a service by asking broader questions about the campaign than have previously been asked.

BENJAMIN G. SCHARFF  
West Virginia University