BOOK REVIEWS


Colonists in Bondage is a comprehensive survey of the origins, development, and character of white servitude and convict labor in British North America from 1607 to 1776. It records the story of the bond servants who constituted so large a part of our colonial population. A various company, these immigrants included persons of decent substance—Protestants fleeing from religious persecution on the continent; poor, starving, and unhappy Scots, Irish, and Germans; and English political and military prisoners—as well as convicts, rogues, and vagabonds. Some arrived as a result of some measure of just and orderly planning; others were decoyed, deceived, inveigled or forcibly kidnapped. Once arrived, they were all subjected to a hard and dangerous way of life in strange regions and difficult climates. Many perished; some fled. “The residue, such as it was, became the American people.”

It is the author’s view that in any comprehensive rationale of the peopling of the colonies a superior position must be given to the large pecuniary profits which obtained from the trade in servants. For English merchants and shippers servants represented a convenient and lucrative outgoing cargo, a cargo which found many anxious bidders in America. The colonial planter, meanwhile, profited from the purchase of servants, for through them he could rise from mere subsistence to prosperity only by commanding the labor of others beside himself. The combination of these “profit motives” produced an atmosphere wherein colonial proprietor, merchants, seamen and emigrant agents were impelled to raise cargoes of servants through methods which ranged from those which were wholly legal and aboveboard to others which were surreptitious and disreputable.

In emphasizing the pecuniary profit motive, Dr. Smith does not ignore the significance of such factors as imperialist visions and necessities, charitable impulses, religious enthusiasms and the various obscure motivations of individual personalities. He insists, rather, that the factor which served to articulate these various threads and to produce the actual migrations is to be found in the pecuniary profits which obtained from the trade
in servants. The author's position is not arbitrarily taken; nor are his arguments tediously drawn. Rather, his discussion is characterized by an orderly presentation of facts and by skillful and scholarly analysis.

"Penal Transportation," the title of Part II of the volume, has an unhappy connotation for persons who prefer the more attractive tradition of the aristocratic beginnings of the American people. However, the relative frightfulness of Dr. Smith's nomenclature is tempered by judicious handling of the story of the people who were concerned in that activity—political and military prisoners, rogues and vagabonds and convicts. Scottish military prisoners of the Civil War are portrayed as the finest kind of human material for the colonies. Larger numbers of Irish appear to have been transported because of the political convenience of classifying as rogues and vagabonds persons who were, in general, anathema to the Puritan Saints.

In dealing with the convicts who were shipped to the colonies, Dr. Smith concludes that the resentment against England in this connection has been considerably overdone, that Britain never forced convicts on the colonies—there was no need so to do; colonial planters received convicts with open arms, so great was their desire for cheap labor. "It was perhaps to the discredit of the English that they shipped their felons to America though they had at least the virtue of a certain humanitarianism; but it was certainly to the discredit of Virginia and Maryland that these felons were shipped at a handsome profit."

From the four essays which constitute Part III of this volume, and which deal with the actual experiences of the immigrant servants, it is possible to cite only very briefly a few of the author's findings and conclusions. He estimates that two out of every ten indentured servants, and a greater proportion of redemptioners, attained independence and esteem. As for the convicts, while their ultimate fate is shrouded in mystery, and while it would be surprising if twenty thousand or more felons did not include some of ability and character, Dr. Smith nevertheless feels it safe to assume that "a good many less than ten out of every hundred of them actually settled down comfortably in the colonies."

The total number of bonded servants in the colonies is a problem on which there has been much conjecture. Dr. Smith's conclusion in this regard is "not less than one-half nor more than two-thirds," an estimate which the author does not present until after he has analyzed a very sizable amount of statistical fragments. These data, happily, are recorded in a 38-page appendix, where numerical tables are amplified by detailed discussions. Professional historians and demographers, together with persons less professionally concerned with the colonial period, will find these data instructive and usable.

Baltimore, Maryland

WALTER FISHER

In this series of essays, Professor Labaree has undertaken to discuss colonial conservatives and some of the most important areas in which their conservatism was displayed. He has not limited himself to the perplexing question of the loyalist in the Revolution, although his study of the conservative mind in the century before the Declaration of Independence leads up to an assessment of the Tory during the war. His method has been first to delineate a few of the groups which displayed predominantly conservative characteristics, and then to show how conservatism operated in selected institutions. In most respects, he accedes to conventional views on the conservative, but both his conclusions and his illustrations are drawn from writings of the time.

Ranging up and down the seaboard, he points out that every colony supported a group of favored families who dominated the political, economic, and social life of the community. These individuals were dedicated to the maintenance of their positions as a matter of self-interest. Government officials, merchants in the towns, large landholders and the clergy of the established churches stood to gain by the preservation of the status quo. Yet the author flatly rejects economic determinism as a solution. He provides no easy formula by which it would be possible, for instance, to explain why the aged and financially independent Benjamin Franklin threw his lot with the revolutionists, while his son stood by the old order. He illustrates the complexity of the conservative pattern in the person of Landon Carter of Virginia, who rejoiced simultaneously over the routing of the royal governor, Lord Dunmore, and the supposed death of the patriot governor, Patrick Henry. After recognizing the importance of materialistic factors in determining a man's loyalty, Professor Labaree concludes that "an essentially conservative temperament" was the most important of several imponderable factors.

Among the most interesting studies presented is one relating to varying attitudes toward the theory of government. The author points out that conservative and liberal alike professed attachment to the English Constitution and that they both paid court to the prevailing faith in a balance of power in government. By the time of the American Revolution, English criticism of this thesis had become sharp, but in America the edifice was apparently not shaken. The differentiation between Whig and Tory lay not in their attachment to the doctrine, but in their ideas of which branch of government was likely to get out of balance. American conservatives like Cadwallader Colden were convinced that it was the democratic element that was to be feared. The compact theory of government was widely accepted in America except among the most reactionary, although it was a Whig fabric tailored to the measure of the Glorious Revolution.
The essentially conservative nature of colonial education and the gradations of the southern social order are familiar pictures, but the question of conservatism in religion is more confusing. The author finds that the Congregational Church in New England and the Anglican Church in the royal colonies were conservative institutions. Where they came into conflict, it depended upon the viewpoint which would be labeled conservative. The Puritans sought to conserve the established social and political order of New England, which appeared to be a radical innovation to the Anglicans. At the same time, the Puritan divines attacked established imperial policies; it was a process that would seem pertinent, although it finds no echo in this essay. The Great Awakening is labeled here as a movement which brought grief to many conservatives, as it certainly was. Yet, the conservative nature of the theology behind it deserves some explanation, too.

Williamsburg, Va.

BROOKE HINDE


Optimistic Philadelphians have at last good reason to believe that certain unsightly areas surrounding the nation's most celebrated shrine are soon to be leveled and a proper setting arranged for Independence Hall. This coming event has heightened a long felt need for a volume devoted entirely to the history of that building.

Through the zeal of Messrs. Eberlein and Hubbard such a book has now been produced. Their work is more than an architectural story of the origin and building of Independence Hall; it is, in accordance with its title, a diary.

Two of the early chapters deal with the reasons for building a state house and the actual erection of the edifice. The chapter on its construction, I particularly recommend. Thereafter, all chapters take their headings from year dates, and, diary-like, some of their paragraphs begin with the day of the week and month.

In this manner many of the most important events which occurred in the State House, the State House Yard, or its immediate vicinity are described. These are events which the building we now call Independence Hall actually witnessed. Notable among them are the many conflicts between the colonial assemblies and governors, the many balls and receptions of dramatic moment, the stamp act meeting and the subsequent celebration over the act's repeal, the meeting of the Continental Congress, the Declaration of Independence, the constitutional convention, the federal period and, finally, as an ending note to the diary, Lafayette's visit in 1824.

In a standard length book it is manifestly impossible to have an individual chapter treatment for every year between 1736 and 1824. However, such treatment has been accorded forty-two of them. The result, while comprehensive, is necessarily kaleidoscopic. Emphasis is placed where the
authors feel it is most deserved; thus one-third of the diary is devoted to the years 1776–1779.

To heighten a contemporary feeling about the events discussed, the present tense is used throughout and blended with a shortened style. Examples of the latter are “Bell arrives at the end of August; steeple ready for it,” and “City’s in a ferment,” instead of “The City is in a ferment.” Mr. Eberlein writes with considerable vigor, employing a flexible vocabulary that ranges from the nearly archaic to the most modern vernacular. He does not mince words, and here we come to a major point.

This is the diary of Independence Hall and not of Mr. Eberlein. That should be borne in mind when one reads about the sinisterness of the Pennsylvania constitution of 1776, when Tom Paine is called “a political polecat,” and an action of General Joseph Reed is labeled “despicable.” One would expect to find a nonpartisan point of view expressed by the venerable building, but in this account one is literally plunged into the arena where one experiences the venom and prejudices of the times, often expressed in nearly violent terms. As reading, it is most entertaining, but there are times when, as history, it lacks balance, a trait not uncharacteristic of writing directed toward the general public.

Supporting evidence for the present story is found in its wealth of documentation and the profuse quotations with which it is buttressed. Mr. Eberlein’s work stems from a wide variety of sources, some here used for the first time.

I do feel that he is a little harsh with the Quaker colonial assemblies for the position they tried to maintain during the French and Indian wars. While telling what they did not do, he does not tell what they did do. This latter, if little enough, still seems deserving of some notice in a study of their actions.

The Diary is an attractive volume. Great interest is added to the text by some fifty-three illustrations, half of these from old prints and drawings which show clearly the various architectural transformations the building underwent. The other half are photographs by Mr. Hubbard, taken with his customary skill, of the present day appearance of the buildings comprising the Independence Hall group. Interested persons have much to thank the authors for in their efforts to recreate the great moments in the life and times of these famous buildings.

Philadelphia

Nicholas B. Wainwright

John Hancock, Patriot in Purple. By Herbert S. Allan. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. xviii, 422 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $6.00.)

In a letter written in 1817, in his late life, acknowledging John Hancock’s contributions to his country, John Adams said: “His life will, however, not ever be written.” Over a hundred years later in 1930, another Adams—James
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Truslow—questioned whether such a biography was worth writing; but within ten years Norman Cousins was stating in the *Saturday Review of Literature*: “Still awaiting first-rate treatment by first-rate biographers, however, are two important figures in American History: John Hancock and Henry Cabot Lodge.” Now, in spite of the prophecy of one Adams, the doubt of another, and perhaps because of the suggestion of a third writer, we do have a life of Hancock by Herbert S. Allan, a former newspaperman and presently a free-lance writer.

Mr. Allan paints Hancock’s picture in detail—at least to the extent of the limited source material available—conscientiously and honestly giving the reader both front and back of his canvas. He gives voluminous notes and citations, a long list of sources (which he or his publishers insist on calling a bibliography), and ends with a mediocre index.

Mr. Allan says that Hancock was vain, arrogant, egotistic, hypersensitive, petulant, exhibitionistic, capricious, vacillating, intemperate, susceptible to flattery, improvident, was somewhat of a demagogue and much of a faker; he could have also charged him “with undue negligence in paying small debts which he owed to mechanics,” even if he does not choose to follow the evidence and charge him with greater crimes concerning his career as Harvard treasurer. The evidence shows him right, although Mr. Allan often seems to attempt to show that his own judgment is wrong. Hancock’s few good traits cannot balance this array, and his appeal on personal grounds to thinking people today is as slight as it was during his lifetime. As a person of mediocre abilities and accomplishments he does not merit a biography. Henry Cabot Lodge has written that few men in history who achieved so much fame really did so little, and left such a slight trace of personal influence on their times.

Hancock played a vital and essential role in those Revolutionary days, however. Lodge calls him the Alcibiades of the rebellious Puritan town. John Adams says that, blunderheaded as were the British, they had sagacity enough to discriminate from all others, for inexorable vengeance, the two men most to be dreaded by them, Samuel Adams and John Hancock. In spite of his character and abilities, therefore, posterity would be foolish and unwise to ignore a man—one of the richest in the Colonies, whose wealth in Massachusetts was exceeded only by that of Bowdoin—who, regardless of his motives, threw the weight of that wealth and position on the side of the rebellion and thereby provided one of the elements without which it might well have been unsuccessful; and it cannot ignore a man who became a Boston selectman, member and speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, Chairman of the Committee of Safety, President of the Continental Congress, Chairman of the Massachusetts Convention for Ratifying the Federal Constitution and the first Governor of the new Commonwealth, holding that office for eleven years—a term longer than that of any successor—even if the abilities he brought to bear on these positions were not outstanding.
We have indeed needed a “first-rate” biography of Hancock; unfortu-
nately we do not have it in this book. The essential material relating to
Hancock personally is here, although Mr. Allan has by no means included
all the available data. He has told us nothing of Hancock as a Boston select-
man or a Massachusetts representative and almost nothing as the Common-
wealth’s first governor. He could have used the newspapers to advantage,
tedious as the task would have been.

What is not here is sufficient background material covering Hancock’s
life. Even if Mr. Allan says that his book is not intended to be a history of
the period, the biography of a public man can be told satisfactorily only
against the history and life of his period as a backdrop, and that backdrop
is often hazy, often much too brief, often omitted. One reason for this has
been the reliance in too many cases on poor secondary sources when orig-
inal ones were available. Another has been Mr. Allan’s own unfamiliarity
with the period he is covering. Preliminary phases of the Revolutionary
struggle, as well as the basic outline of the struggle itself, are inadequately
presented even if understood. The same is true of Shay’s Rebellion and the
political situation in Massachusetts following the war.

This general lack of familiarity may be the reason for the extraordinarily
large number of errors found in the book. A very few should be mentioned.
Hancock was not on the committee appointed by the town of Boston to
draw up instructions to its representatives in 1765. Mrs. Ebenezer Hancock,
sister of John Lowell, Jr., was the daughter of Michael Lowell of Charles-
town and not John Lowell. James Warren was from Plymouth and not
Salem. A letter of Edmund Quincy of 22 July, 1775, has been read so in-
correctly that Hancock is placed in Lancaster, Massachusetts, before the
August recess of Congress. Mr. Allan did not even need to consult “original
sources whenever and wherever accessible” to have avoided all his dif-
ficulties with Harvard material. He says, “The title of ‘Sir’ was conferred
upon all holders of a B.A. (which could be acquired in three years) who re-
mained in residence for another year to obtain an M.A.” Actually, the
Bachelor’s degree was conferred after a four-year course, and the Master’s
three years thereafter merely by appearing at Commencement, so that
Hancock was A.B., 1754, and A.M., 1757. Again his remarks about social
prestige and placing are not completely accurate; he could easily have found
out that Hancock was placed fifth in a class of twenty. When the General
Court adjourned to Cambridge in 1764, because of the smallpox epidemic
in Boston, the Assembly was obviously not sitting in Hollis Hall—a dormi-
tory. It used the lower floor of Harvard Hall. And of course it was not
John Hancock who was reimbursed for losses in the fire at this time, but
Tutor Belcher Hancock. Mr. Allan’s story of this incident is a good example
of the manner in which he has so often invented history. Of course there are
errors in dates of letters—one in this Society’s collection—and in news-
papers; one instance of the latter might indicate that Moore’s Diary of the
Revolution was the source actually used. Finally, when one reads that the
Sons of Liberty stemmed from the Committees of Correspondence, and that the Harvard buildings were requisitioned by the British during the 1775-1776 campaign, one is almost bound to question the validity of everything in the book.

Such are a few of the errors noted. Some may seem trivial—some are certainly basic—but all are indicative of the superficial approach to the study. If this were a light popular story after the manner of Parson Weems and not the "fully-developed biography" it purports to be, one might not take issue with mere facts. Unfortunately, facts seem to have some relevance in a biography of this nature.

A final and more important comment is necessary. From chapter to chapter Mr. Allan seems at a loss in interpreting the material he has gathered; he is continually making gratuitous contradictory statements and interpretations of his own unsupported by any evidence. He either cannot make up his own mind on particular points or is unwilling to accept the judgment of his own court. As an example of contradiction he correctly states that Hancock's position as President of Congress had "little more weight than the chairmanship of a convention" and that he was in many respects "merely a glorified clerk," but he thereafter proceeds to endow him with all the executive and administrative functions of a later president and in general place on his shoulders all the responsibilities of running Congress and carrying on the civil affairs of government, of course consistently calling him "the President" and "President Hancock."

The affected journalistic style of the book is not felicitous; it is one reason why it is in fact dull and tiresome. The basic fault may not lie entirely with Mr. Allan; his subject has much to do with it. Regardless of what other material there is for an interpretation of Hancock there is certainly a paucity of anything that gives him life, gusto, and zest.

We still need the "first-rate" biography, but one unfortunate result of this book may be again to deter the qualified person from attempting it. We may delight in volume after volume about an Adams, Franklin, Washington—but not a Hancock. At the moment, as the only story available, the book is necessary for one wishing to learn anything of the Massachusetts patriot.

Philadelphia

Hamilton Vaughan Bail


Professor John Richard Alden has done a creditable study in General Gage in America. He undertook a large field to explore; the French and Indian wars and the events leading up to the Revolution would seem to be sufficient for any author, but Alden adds the first year of the Revolution
itself. Obviously, he could touch only the high points in some three hundred
pages, but it seems to this reviewer that he has given a satisfactory picture
of Thomas Gage, about whom little has been known.

The style of the book is easy and not too controversial. Professor Alden
says that he has used the Gage Papers in the William L. Clements Library,
which have been accessible only a few years. I have a feeling that both
Allen French and Kenneth Murdoch have combed them pretty thoroughly;
they were, however, not primarily interested in Gage, the man. In any
event, Alden quotes extensively from Gage's correspondence with British
Cabinet Officers, especially his friend Barrington. All of this correspondence
only corroborates how little any of the British really understood conditions
in the colonies—Massachusetts, in particular.

We receive a picture in Thomas Gage of a sincere, friendly, agreeable
gentleman of the old school, never very effective, but trying hard to carry
out rather indecisive orders from "Home." In Mrs. Stuart Wortley's A
Prime Minister and His Son, another picture of Gage is drawn in a letter
by Major Charles Stuart in 1775: "The hatred the troops have for the
rebels lulls the dislike they hold for Gen. Gage." At all events, his job seemed
to be to make the colonies obey various disagreeable laws, without coming
to actual blows with them. This was obviously impossible, as Gage re-
peatedly declared in his demands for more men. Gage seems to have been a
"servant of the King," and an individual secondarily. He seldom moved
without approval from Dartmouth or North, and when he did (at Lexing-
ton and Concord), he waited for that approval before going any further.
It was inevitable that he would fail, and as Alden writes, "his recall could
have been no surprise."

Ever since the days of Bancroft, there has been an apparently unsub-
stantiated rumor that Margaret Kemble Gage had given information to the
Patriots that the British were going to march out of Boston for Concord
on April 19. Alden denies this categorically, and seems to prove his denial
satisfactorily; another of the "old women's tales" of the Revolution is thus
exploded. Again, we read: "It is a strange fact that many writers have
pictured Gage as telling his superior in London that it would be an easy
matter to conquer the Americans. No man was more aware of the true
situation than he was." Gage did know the colonial situation; his own cor-
respondence denies any confidence in it.

It seems as if every reviewer must find some criticism, and mine is that
Alden has not documented sufficiently controversial points, and has over-
documented accepted ones. His statement, "According to Preston, the most
effective of his four lawyers [Boston Massacre Trial] was Robert Auchmuty,
although John Adams and [Josiah] Quincy have recently been given
major credit for his defense," is new to this reviewer, although the source of
it is not clear. For the curious, also, it would have been interesting if Alden
had indentified "Mrs. F—G," Gage's young mistress, alluded to in the
Town and Country of 1781.
Considering the book as a whole, however, *General Gage in America* is a highly satisfactory volume, and should add much to our knowledge of the colonies from 1755 to 1775.

Philadelphia

**Frederic R. Kirkland**


(New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. xiv, 538 p. Index. $6.00.)

As the penultimate decade of the eighteenth century drew to a close, the American states made rapid strides toward national unity. Despite a welter of conflicting ideologies and motives, a remarkably sound Constitution had been created and ratified, capable executive officers had been selected, and a body of lawmakers generally favorable to the new experiment had been elected to the First Congress. But, however promising these accomplishments were, the auspices for permanence were not uniformly good. At the very beginning and on through the first twelve years many doubted that the new government would endure. Such doubts, founded on recollections of the floundering Confederation and on an awareness of conflicting interests, personalities, and sections, were by no means unreasonable. Suspicion of government was rife, particularly so of one that could command extensive military and financial resources. The states, it was contended, would be forced to sacrifice much or all of their authority to an all-encompassing national power. These things were much in men’s minds when the government began operating, and they were seldom forgotten during the Federalist period.

Structurally sound and elastic enough to allow wide accommodation, the Constitution was nevertheless only a framework. All the detailed and indispensable machinery necessary to the proper functioning of government had to be devised, and, in addressing themselves to this task, Washington and Congress found few precedents but many questions.

The power of the President was great, but it was in no sense complete. Could he, for example, remove a Cabinet officer without the advice and consent of the Senate? Should he alone be responsible for administration or should he share that duty with the Senate? What was the relative position of the President and his department heads? Was he obligated to consult them before making major policy decisions? What were the boundaries of executive and legislative power? Should the President meet with the lawmakers or select a spokesman to present his views? Should he seek the assistance of the Senate in negotiating treaties or merely submit the completed document for ratification? Should the department heads attend general legislative sessions to assist in making laws?

The answers to these questions were to be found not in precedents or handbooks on administrative government, but in practical experience, in the interaction of executive and legislative functions. In a situation of this kind conscientious industry, patience, and common sense were at a pre-
mium. And it was indeed fortunate for the country that these qualities were pre-eminent in the chief executive. The Constitution had made the office a powerful one, and Congress showed little hesitancy in placing the great bulk of administrative authority in Washington’s hands. As a consequence, all major administrative decisions were made by a President who was not reluctant to accept full responsibility. His efficiency, painstaking attention to detail, energy and system were in sharp contrast to the incompetence of many officials in the Confederation. Although he wrote no formal treatises on the requisite qualities of a chief executive—preferring instead to let his actions speak for him—he knew what good administration was. Steady and judicious, he acted as a balance for his brilliant Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton.

To Hamilton goes the accolade for administrative organization. He “was the greatest administrative genius of his generation in America, and one of the great administrators of all time.” He handled all problems with energetic efficiency; and not content to remain within the confines of his own department, he meddled in all others and extended his influence everywhere.

If before taking up The Federalists one were inclined to seek a definition of public administration, he would, in all likelihood, turn to the Encyclopædia of the Social Sciences. There he would find an article on the subject by none other than the author here under review. This is an excellent indication of the esteem in which Mr. White is held by the scholars who edited that work. Author of several volumes on administration, he is well equipped to describe the peculiar administrative problems of Presidents Washington and John Adams.

Concerned primarily with governmental administrative functions during the Federalist period, Mr. White has produced an excellent reference book in a field that heretofore has not received the consideration it merited. Little escapes his attention, and, relying extensively on original sources, he has presented a multifaceted view of the workaday administrative world. He rides with the mail carrier, watches the collection and disbursement of revenues, sits at the desk of the lowliest clerk, follows the threads of executive orders and interdepartmental relations, and goes into the wilderness with the territorial governors. Happily Mr. White avoids the pitfall of many who deal with subjects involving great detail—he does not become entangled in minutiae at the expense of interpretation, and at refreshing intervals he leans back from his notes to present helpful summations and analyses of Federalist contributions to the administrative art.

The writer assumes, and rightly so, that the reader will bring to the perusal of The Federalists a fair knowledge of the general history of the period. Covering a narrow field thoroughly, he does not closely examine the highly controversial political and economic issues of the day against which administrative procedure evolved. This, as Mr. White states, has been done by others. It is his main object to emphasize the practical problems of
administration, and in this he has succeeded. In brief, this careful and mature work is a valuable contribution to the Federalist period and to American administrative history.

Temple University

Harry M. Tinkcom


Time has not dealt kindly with the reputation of Francis Lieber. Today the vigorous and energetic publicist, once acclaimed as a leader of the nation, is remembered only by a small group of German-American specialists. Histories of American thought and literature pass over him incidentally or ignore him. In death, even more than in life, his tireless ambition to rank as one of the great minds of history has been bitterly thwarted. Only today, seventy-five years after his death, have we finally received a definitive biography. The bulky Life and Letters, early compiled by Perry, was neither orderly nor comprehensive. The later biographical studies of Harley, Phinney, and Bruncken, while noteworthy for incisive analysis, did not afford comprehensive delineation. Several excellent studies of special aspects of Leiber's scholarship have not pretended to deal with the man as a whole.

To fill this small gap in the history of American thought, Dr. Freidel has labored with unusual assiduity and perceptiveness. The thoroughness with which he has investigated his subject matter, the patient conscientiousness with which he has recorded his sources, are monuments to the success with which American scholarship has incorporated the scholarly German methodology for which Lieber himself stood. He has effectively utilized the lush tangle of diaries, letters, sketches, essays, articles and pamphlets which stood at his disposal—for Leiber was sufficiently convinced of his own greatness to record his experiences and ideas incessantly and to preserve them to the last jot.

To those who may have hoped for the re-emergence of Leiber as one of America's great liberals this book must come as a disappointment. Perhaps it is this disillusionment which slows down Dr. Freidel's vivacious opening chapters to a pedestrian pace. Slowly, but inevitably, one realizes that Leiber's high idealism, keen perception, fine balance, and creative energy were bound to earth by his overweening vanity, emotional instability, compromising inconsistency, and lack of originality. At the same time, the reader cannot fail to be moved by the impressive recital of the great idealist's contributions to his own day and time, nor fail to realize the importance of his major achievements as editor of the first comprehensive American encyclopedia, author of the first American texts on political science and legal interpretation, and compiler of the first modern code of international law. In all this work Lieber effectively united American experience with
Continental culture, and supplied a consistent rationale for the needs of the growing nation.

In Freidel's biography, as in Lieber's life, the wealth of material tends at times to obscure the main outlines. One wonders, also, whether Lieber's family life was so completely subordinated to his public activities as in the book. These are, however, but small flaws in the general excellence of the presentation. Especially praiseworthy is the success with which the author has suppressed his own judgments, to achieve an objectivity rare among contemporary writers. Yet his thorough appreciation of his subject is evident in the fine perception with which he unifies the inconsistencies of Lieber's later years. His concluding sentences, typical of the entire book, contain probably the best evaluation of the great publicist yet offered to the public:

Though he was not, as he had supposed, a great and original thinker, Lieber had transported to the new world a rich cargo of alien concepts. Strange and difficult at first, these ideas lost their exotic flavor and became by the time of his death an integral part of the American tradition. More significant than Lieber himself, these concepts remained common coin while their innovator's name disappeared. As a conveyer and synthesizer, if not as an originator, Lieber was indeed great.

Philadelphia

EUGENE E. DOLL

Frederick Douglass. By BENJAMIN QUARLES. (Washington: The Associated Publishers, 1948. xii, 380 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $4.00.)

In his foreword to this first full-length biography of Frederick Douglass to appear in over forty years and the first to be written with due deference to the requirements of historical scholarship, Professor Quarles has said that to the Negroes of a later generation Douglass has become a legend. While he does not state that he desires to do so, Professor Quarles has gone about the task of separating the facts of Douglass' life from the legend which has grown up about him with great diligence and with considerable success. If there is a shortcoming in this volume it lies completely in the area of that success, for in the process of ordering the facts of Douglass' extraordinarily complex life, Professor Quarles has at the same time removed the drama and color from what was, after all, an astounding theatrical career.

Frederick Douglass was nineteenth-century America's leading Negro abolitionist, reformer, journalist, orator, politician, diplomat and spokesman. His was a full and crowded career, complex in its personal relationships and complex in its meaning. Douglass knew and worked with, in varying degrees of intimacy, the great and near-great of nearly all of the humanitarian and reform movements from the forties to the nineties. On both sides of the Atlantic he was in the thick of the fractious antislavery movement, making friends and enemies both within and without the various segments of abolitionism. His relations with the Free Soil, Liberty, Republican and,
finally, the National Radical Reformer's parties—the last running him for the vice-presidency on a ticket with Victoria Woodhull at the same time that Douglass was supporting Grant's candidacy—were themselves full enough to deserve monographic treatment. His co-operation, or lack of it, with John Brown, his efforts and hopes in the Civil War, his role as editor, and his Haitian mission—all contributed to a full life under circumstances often most trying. That Douglass, the fugitive slave from Maryland, should become a figure of national stature and importance is not so remarkable as that Douglass, "broad rather than deep," as Professor Quarles characterizes him, should have been able to maintain a position of prominence in so many fields over so many years.

From manuscript collections, periodicals, pamphlets, diaries and Douglass memorabilia, Professor Quarles has documented the career of Frederick Douglass in some detail. But in removing the legendary aura from Douglass—and this in itself is a job very much worth the doing, since Douglass has been the subject of a willful misinterpretation in pamphlets and articles professing to see in him the native proto-Marxian thinker of America's most oppressed people, and since the only recent book-length treatments of him have been novelized biographies—Professor Quarles has not left a full-bodied figure for the reader to grasp and understand. He has necessarily introduced into his narrative dozens of the persons with whom Douglass was associated. The index lists over a hundred worthies of the reform movements alone, but it does not begin to exhaust the textual references. Lydia Maria Child and Elizabeth Buffum Chace, for example, do not make the index listing. As a result, the text is a crowded one, and in the crush of temperance, suffrage, and antislavery leaders Douglass himself is almost crowded off the stage. Only in his domestic life and in his attendance at the funerals of the great, which are sprinkled through the last half of the text, does Douglass emerge as a solid being.

The compression of so much into the text has denied Professor Quarles the opportunity to describe and analyze Douglass as an orator or as a writer. It has forced him to write with few of the details which would recreate his subject as a living being. The magnificent performance of the aged Douglass in the face of jeers at the Chicago World's Fair, for example, is not described at all, although the discomfiture of the young poet Dunbar is presented in detail. If this event is apocryphal, it would be helpful if it were noted as such. As a result, though a modern, factual account of Frederick Douglass has been made available, the full biography must yet be awaited. What Professor Quarles has already done is a formidable task of scholarship. His opening chapter is an excellent interpretative summary. He has left no trace of the minority historian's tendency to view his materials out of perspective. But, perhaps because of the crowded life which he is presenting, he has not quite presented his materials in full perspective. Nevertheless, the present account is solid and sound as a narrative. It will be of value to the cultural and social historian of the period, and it con-
stitutes a worthy addition to the literature of the Negro in America—a literature which, though growing vastly day by day, still needs sound and calm studies of the sort reviewed here perhaps more than many of the tracts and treatises which it annexes unto itself.

Washington, D. C. ULYSSES LEE


With The Disruption of American Democracy Professor Nichols completes his trilogy on national politics in the last decade of the antebellum era—his previous volumes on the subject, it will be recalled, were The Democratic Machine 1850-1854, and Franklin Pierce. His detailed knowledge of the political history of this period marks him as a political historian hardly second to James F. Rhodes.

The author considers that the fundamental cause of the breakup of the Democratic Party and, consequently, the breakup of the Union was the failure of the political leaders to understand that they were operating not only the “political mechanism of a federal republic composed of thirty-one states,” but a federation of major sections or regions with distinct cultures and therefore different interests. This “cultural federalism,” the author maintains, was a more “powerful conditioner of voting behavior” than political parties or any other factor. The attitudes of the Northern cultural sections leading finally to aggressive self-assertion were what the author terms New Englandism, metropolitanism in the East, territorialism in the Northwest, and antislaveryism in all the North; and the attitudes of the Southern region, which consolidated the Northeast and Northwest in an anti-Southern policy, he terms Southernism. These terms are descriptive of the self-interest of the several sections. The author contends—as have many historians before him—that the South, through the Democratic Party, dominated the national government during the greater part of the antebellum period, and that it ignored and frustrated the interests of free-state territorialism, New Englandism, metropolitanism, and antislaveryism. The natural result of this policy of frustration was the rise of the Republican Party as the political instrument of metropolitanism, antislaveryism, New Englandism, and the sloughing off of the Douglass Democrats of the Northwest in an effort to serve the “territorialism” of that region.

The theme of a dominant South constantly checkmating the ambitions and interest of the more populous and—in material though not political affairs—more enterprising sections of the country runs through the book; but the author’s great preoccupation with the minutiae of Congressional politics and the intrigues of the clashing factions of the national Democratic machine tends to obscure his thesis. When one gets involved in an account
of the perennial graft connected with government printing contracts, mail subsidies, and Congressional logrolling, he wonders why the author devoted so much space to such trivia and so little to demonstrating, for example, how Slidell, Benjamin, Bayard and Bright manipulated Buchanan's nomination, or how the Southern "Senatorial managers" so greatly influenced the secession of the lower South. Indeed, the reviewer would like to see a play-by-play account of the process by which the South dominated the Federal government during the fifties. Turner, in his United States, 1830–1850, found, at least for the period that he examined, that there was in Congress a constant flux in the sectional support of or opposition to legislative measures and no sustained dominance by the South or any other section. At one time it would be the Northwest and South Central States supporting a liberal land measure, and the Northeast and Southeast opposing; then it would be the Southwest and Northwest favoring a "Fifty-four forty or fight" settlement with Great Britain and the Northeast and Southeast supporting a settlement on the forty-ninth parallel. During this period as in the fifties the South was, it will be recalled, the bulwark of the Democratic Party, and as such had a powerful voice in the choice of the President—though at any time the Northern Democrats could have blocked a Southern choice under the two-thirds rule. In the matter of Congressional legislation, however, the South at no time wielded any such direct power. Could it be that Professor Nichols has overestimated the dominant position of the South in national legislation and even in national elections during the fifties? Or is it that he has assumed too much knowledge on the part of the reader and has failed to set forth his evidence?

The failure of the author to sustain—to the satisfaction of the reviewer at least—his theme of Southern dominance still leaves the book a brilliant and valuable contribution to the political history of the late antebellum period. His last chapters, and especially the section dealing with the several attempts at compromise, are exciting but discouraging commentaries on American statesmanship.

Vanderbilt University

FRANK L. OWSLEY


This is an excellent study of frontier Whig politics in Illinois down to and including the congressional election of 1846, with emphasis on the last three years. The author presents very carefully the three rival Whig politicians from the Illinois Seventh Congressional District, the only consistently Whig district in the state. The three political rivals were John J. Hardin, Edward D. Baker, and Abraham Lincoln.

These three men were eager to become the Whig candidate for Congress
in 1843, but unfortunately only one could obtain the nomination. In order to maintain Whig unity in the district, Lincoln, so it would seem, engineered an agreement with his two rivals that each would serve one term in Congress and retire until each had had his turn in the House of Representatives. When Hardin was nominated in the Whig convention of the Seventh Congressional District at Pekin after a hot contest, Lincoln, according to the author, revealed then his farsighted plan:

He [Lincoln] was chairman of the eight-man delegation from Sangamon County, and acting in that capacity he withdrew Baker’s candidacy [in 1843], thus enabling Hardin to be nominated by unanimous vote. Immediately thereafter... Lincoln introduced a resolution, which was adopted... by a vote of 18 to 14, to the effect that “this convention, as individuals, recommend E. D. Baker as a suitable person to be voted for by the Whigs of this district, for Representative to Congress, at the election of 1844, subject to the decision of a District Convention, should the Whigs of the district think proper to hold one.” This resolution was immediately bolstered by another to the effect that the Seventh District Whigs be requested to hold the next district convention at Tremont the following year.

The author adds:

Lincoln, conceding that he could not be nominated in 1843—that Hardin had beaten both himself and Baker—had formulated a plan which would permit the satisfaction of the ambition of all three: each should be nominated in turn, with Baker following Hardin and, although this was not specified, with Lincoln following Baker. By this act he salvaged no little of Baker’s prospects, for his resolution placed Baker in a very strong position for the 1844 campaign. True, the Pekin convention could not bind its successor, but its action was a powerful recommendation. The supporting resolution, with its “request” that the Whigs hold their next district convention in Tremont, was likewise a subtle stroke, engineered by Lincoln, to further the nominating convention which he never ceased to urge upon his [objecting] fellow Whigs.

Everything seemed to move according to plan: Hardin was elected and announced that he would not run in 1844, so Baker was nominated and elected; he announced, in due time, that he would not be a candidate to succeed himself; therefore, Lincoln expected 1846 to be his turn to serve in the national House of Representatives. Lincoln wisely planned his campaign, though by assuming that Hardin would be a rival candidate. Hardin did again attempt to get the nomination on the ground that he had never entered an agreement of “turn about is fair play” with anyone. Besides, Hardin accused Lincoln of unethical practices in seeking the nomination. Lincoln completely outtimed, outmaneuvered, outgeneraled and outwitted his rival. He even outdistanced him in securing control of the press. Realizing that he could not be nominated, Hardin contributed his defeat to the fact that his “warmest personal friends” had not been informed that he contemplated being a candidate for Congress, and “had been solicited by Lincoln and had pledged their vote to him.” Hardin felt Lincoln’s “shrewd
and timely campaigning to be immoral." He now withdrew from the race, which assured Lincoln's nomination.

Lincoln, therefore, was nominated by the District Convention as the Whig candidate for Congress. He now showed his natural ability to heal political wounds and party schisms.

The book is more than just a history of the Whig party in a frontier prairie state. It is a history of the growth of Illinois and its effect upon the political fortunes of Abraham Lincoln.

This excellent study contains thirteen chapters which include the population growth of the territory and state of Illinois, Lincoln's four terms in the state legislature, his political ambition and defeat for the Whig nomination to Congress in 1843, his skill in securing the nomination of 1846, the Congressional Campaign and election of 1846, and the control of the press. The bibliography is selective and the index is adequate.

Lehigh University

George D. Harmon


t


As the decades since the Civil War have passed, interpretations of that great American cataclysm have continued to succeed each other in almost bewildering array. Now William B. Hesseltine has examined for the first time one of the most revealing aspects of the struggle—President Lincoln's relations with the northern war governors. In his penetrating study, he has demonstrated brilliantly the irrevocable manner in which Lincoln dealt a death blow to states rights in the North as well as in the South.

In 1860, a congeries of state Republican parties elected to the presidency a man who outwardly was the type of laconic figurehead so customarily nominated. Following the elections, Republican governors in their inaugurals tried to lay down policies for the new President, and proceeded throughout 1861 to endeavor through the raising, supplying, and direction of troops, to put their program into effect. By implication, the President was to follow rather than lead.

Three years later at the dedication of the Gettysburg battlefield, the governors planned a spectacle to demonstrate the predominant role of the northern states in the struggle. Lincoln attended, and in a few phrases on the nature of the struggle underscored an irrefutable truth—what had begun as a war between states had become a conflict between the South and a unified national power. The governors had come to fill a minor role; Lincoln and the Congress were overwhelmingly pre-eminent.

Professor Hesseltine has painstakingly amassed and marshalled quantities of details to illustrate step by step how this shift took place. As he adroitly shifts his attention from state to state, he shows how widely differing gubernatorial personalities and internal state conditions led, nevertheless, to a common debacle for states rights.
Almost immediately Lincoln and his cabinet challenged the right of the governors to control in the least the conduct of troops in the field; gradually they wrested from them most of the perquisites that went with recruiting. The state regiments came in time to form a national army that was loyal above all to Father Abraham. The governors when they met in conference at Altoona in 1863 might yet have forced Lincoln’s hand through a radical demand for emancipation. But the President chose this exact moment to undercut them with the preliminary Emancipation Proclamation. His control over troops, contracts, and the swollen federal patronage all contributed to the end. By the late fall of 1863 many a governor was dependent upon federal troops in order to win elections. Lincoln, not the governors, called the tune.

Students of Pennsylvania history will find ample data on Andrew Gregg Curtin and a valuable basis for comparing him with the war governors. Professor Hesseltine considered him too “orotund and confused” to master Lincoln.

In Pennsylvania and elsewhere, Lincoln won his victory partly because his opposition did not organize, and primarily because of his superior intellect. Professor Hesseltine also notes the new national economic system based on federal supported banking, railroads, and industry. Because of it, “of necessity, state politics revolved in the national orbit.” This, however, is not his story. His more specialized analysis is a distinguished contribution to American constitutional history and to an understanding of the Civil War.

Vassar College

Frank Freidel


Nathaniel P. Banks, the Bobbin Boy of Waltham, was one of those adventurers in America who live by their political wits. He was blessed with enough political genius to maintain himself at this uncertain game, but not enough character and administrative sense to make himself great. He spent a somewhat precarious long life, grasping expedient after expedient. This trait is illustrated most vividly by the fact that he changed parties eight times in the fifty and more years of his political life.

He started his political activity as a popular young wage-worker whose pleasant personality and oratorical ability made him a natural political labor leader in the Massachusetts factory town where he worked. It was an uphill fight against the well-entrenched Whigs, but he was smart enough to unite enthusiasm for workingmen’s rights with antislaveryism and Americanism and thus emerge a Republican. As the first Republican speaker of the National House and as governor of Massachusetts, he attracted some attention as a presidential possibility in 1856 and 1860. With the coming of
the Civil War he hurried into a general’s uniform, and at its close he came back to Congress where he served on and off for seven terms.

As a general, his lack of administrative capacity and military sense made him one of the mistakes in command which politics foisted on the Union army. As an impecunious Congressman, he eked out his salary by accepting presents for acting as a lobbyist. He was chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and, at the same time, actively involved in a number of financial schemes, some of which were questionable.

When he broke with Grant in 1872 and supported Greeley his fortunes began to wane. He did get back to Congress three times, but never to his place of influence, and much of the time he was supported by a sinecure in Boston. Even here his administrative incapacity caught up with him and he was discharged.

This tale of political adventuring is told honestly with no attempt to gloss over weakness. Banks’ good qualities are presented attractively, and one lays down the book with a sense of having been introduced to a man who was very human and attractive, but who lacked what it takes to be a statesman. Democracy produces many such.

University of Pennsylvania

ROY F. NICHOLS

Toward the Morning. By HERVEY ALLEN. (New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948. vi, 148 p. $3.00.)

This is certainly the best of the historical novels which have been crowding upon the reading public for some time. There is more stature and sweep to the story, less maneuvering of historical facts, greater credibility. Hervey Allen writes with a remarkable sense of affinity with his chosen historical period, and, although his writing is a bit labored at times (particularly in his description of nature), he rather successfully carries his reader back to the more settled frontier towns in which a still rough life was becoming infused with the amenities of the civilization of the coastal cities.

In Toward the Morning the reader will find none of the thrilling excitement of Indian raids and massacres, of the ordeals of the forest and fort, of the uncertain, restless existence in the outpost settlements, such as Bedford village. This type of suspense is felt only in the recent memory of the comparatively secure, in the moving story of the return of the Indian captives. In contrast, this third volume of Mr. Allen’s five-volume work provides the more suppressed excitement of discovery, the discovery of the many little things making up “civilization”—the wearing of city clothes, a harpsichord, a shop window with panes of wavering glass.

For what every reviewer has remarked about Toward the Morning must be reiterated here. This is a reversal of the usual novel technique—from the known to the unknown. In this novel the story is carried out of the wilderness into civilization. Hervey Allen has not overlooked the fact that certain
traces of savagery, particularly in the case of Salathiel Albine, must prove a conditioning factor in the meeting of the more ordered and complex life of an organized society. Thus, it is through eyes unaccustomed to the scene that the reader experiences a fresh and lively picture of Pennsylvania in the 1760's. The components of the picture are familiar; their treatment in this story gives them a peculiar newness impossible to achieve in a more traditional narrative.

Although the social aspects of Toward the Morning are pervasive, they cannot obscure the individuals impinged upon that background. There is a constant interaction which makes each more vital. Salathiel Albine and Melissa, as the central figures, carry the story well, and emerge with more clearly defined personalities. But others, too, stand out as memorable figures—Yates, Bouquet, Captain Jack, Bridget, Malycal and Hercules, Whuzz-Bang Wully Grant, and Colonel Vandercliff (with his story within a story). The missionary ministers of the frontier seem to suffer a bit under Mr. Allen's pen, but their caricature serves to point up the reality of those men in meeting the wilderness with Bible and gun, and in rising to the emotion of a people ruled by the practical.

One could give almost endless examples of sharply drawn pictures from the novel—Fort Lyttleton on Guy Fawkes Day, the severed hand of David Ap Poer, crowded Carlisle, gateway to the West, with its society and its transients, the incredible camp-meeting. Also there are those many suggestions of things to come—Melissa's fantasies, the child Bridget, Vandercliff, the newly and artfully acquired lands in Florida. These must await volume four.

Hervey Allen has proved himself to be a master story-teller; he has appreciated the drama of everyday history and has used it well. In its own way, Toward the Morning is very exciting reading.

L. V. G.


The Pennsylvania Society of the Sons of the Revolution has just published a new volume on the regimental and other flags of the American Revolution. It was compiled in an attempt to "popularize" the subject, and although based on fact (where it could be found), the color of tradition has not been forgotten. The author claims little original research, but has based his book on previous works on American flags of this period.

The presence of the flags themselves, as well as their description in contemporary paintings and writings, indicates that many were carried during the Revolution. However, few were authorized until late in the war, and many were the personal choices of regimental officers. Many more have probably been lost than have been preserved. It is, therefore, of interest and
value to preserve the history of those extant today, or of those whose descriptions prove the only clue to their onetime use.

Mr. Schermerhorn has divided his book into two sections: Part I deals with thirty-nine American Revolutionary flags (thirty-eight are shown in color plates); Part II describes the French flags of the period, nineteen of them regimental colors (fifteen are shown in color plates). It is of interest that replicas of thirty-nine of these Revolutionary flags are in the possession of the Pennsylvania Society of the Sons of the Revolution, seven of these being French flags. Mr. Schermerhorn has written a readable and documented account in this history and description of the flags he has included and of the military situations in which they figured, and many popular misconceptions—as, for example, the story of the Betsy Ross flag and accounts of some of the French flags—are exploded.

Flags have always been an integral part of all military units, and this recent story brings to date the story of the colors carried in the American Revolution. The volume is a most attractive one, and the flag drawings of Stanley Edwards Whiteway contribute much to the understanding of Mr. Schermerhorn's account.

L. V. G.

(Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948. 153 p. Index. $1.50.)

This interpretation of the forces underlying the development of the American churches is an outgrowth of the Beckley lectureship of the British Methodist Conference, which William Warren Sweet held in 1946, and is largely a synthesis of his own authoritative writings in the field of American church history. It is a thoroughly readable book, which provides a concise, yet full, exposition of the unique character of the American churches.

The chief mark of distinction of the American churches is activism—that social concept of religion which makes it a functioning part of all living, and not the separate segment of society which it has become in other nations. The nature of the American national growth has made it so: the planting of left-wing Protestantism, outlawed in the Old World, the influence of westward expansion and revivalism, the fundamental beliefs in freedom of religion and the separation of church and state. Discussions of Roman Catholicism, the multiplicity of Protestant denominations, the effect of the Negro and of his social and religious problems on the churches, the churches and reform movements, contemporary interdenominational trends—these too are included.

The *American Churches* is an excellent summary volume on the basic historical factors in the growth and development of organized religion in America.

The Woodrow Wilson Bibliography is compiled largely from the Woodrow Wilson Collection of the Princeton University Library, as well as from the Wilson papers in the Library of Congress. It is not a new research, but a revision, presenting Wilson’s papers not chronologically, but under subject divisions: books, collected addresses and writings, addresses and writings published in periodicals and pamphlets, letters and public papers. The Bibliography also includes sections on newspaper reports of Wilson’s speeches, statements, and public papers by Arthur S. Link, and on books in the Wilson field by Katharine E. Brand.

Miss Turnbull has written that this is not a definitive bibliography, but rather a working tool for scholars and readers interested in Wilson. She has admirably achieved this aim; this small volume is not only an excellent reference work, but in its very listings provides more than a clue to the mental stature of Woodrow Wilson.


A new volume (XIII) of The Territorial Papers of the United States has recently been published—The Territory of Louisiana-Missouri, 1803-1806. This is the first of three volumes on this region, which will bring the story down to 1821. Mr. Carter has edited documents, letters, petitions and other relevant papers from the archives in Washington to present the first compilation of the extensive documentation for this great territory. The volume is chronologically arranged under three headings: papers relating to the foundations of the territory of Louisiana-Missouri, 1803-1804; papers relating to the District of Louisiana, 1804-1805; papers relating to the administration of Governor Wilkinson, 1805-1806. There is no editorial interpretation of the papers, but the source of each is provided.

The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography is pleased to draw the attention of its readers to the new format of the 1948 Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine, published by the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania. This magazine, edited by Dr. John G. Herndon, might well be considered a sister publication to the Magazine, for it offers a desirable genealogical balance to the latter’s well-established historical emphasis. The Editors hope that the readers of the Magazine will avail themselves of the many opportunities offered by the Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine.