

BOOK REVIEWS

George Washington. A Biography. Volume III: *Planter and Patriot*; Volume IV: *Leader of the Revolution.* By DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951. XI, 600; X, 736 p. Maps, illustrations, appendices, bibliography, index. \$15.00.)

This segment of Mr. Freeman's great work carries the life of Washington from January, 1759, to the arrival of the news of the French alliance in April, 1778. It covers the most critical years in the life of the most important man in modern history, and does it with a thoroughness which will make this the standard reference work for the life of Washington for generations to come. There will be many other, and some better, interpretations, but there will be no need in the foreseeable future again to put in order the whole vast mass of material relating to Washington. Mr. Freeman and his assistants have done an excellent job of digging out obscure sources, and there can be little significant material still undiscovered.

Washington is a very difficult subject for a biographer. His personal characteristics and his identification with his times do not lend themselves to biography. The half of the third volume in this set relating to the war in Massachusetts is hardly more of a biography than French's *First Year*. Mr. Freeman's attitude toward his subject emphasizes this difficulty. He never writes from within Washington; he observes him and reports upon him. He deliberately avoids the spectacular and omits such enlightening, if not entirely verifiable, tales as that of Washington's anger when a Yankee Negro boy of Cambridge presumed to ask wages for his services.

This attitude and a tendency to bring in a great mass of detail make Mr. Freeman's first three volumes hard to read. It might be well for librarians to quicken the appetites of potential readers by having them begin with volume four, in which an embarrassing richness of source material has compelled Mr. Freeman to select and generalize, with the result that he has produced an absorbing history of the war in the Middle Colonies.

Historians as well as laymen will find that there is too much of the machinery of scholarship in these volumes. On many pages the footnotes take more space than the text. One would rather accept Mr. Freeman's work and dispense with distracting footnote references for such unimportant facts as the exact number of spots with which Jackie Custis broke out when inoculated. Volume three would have been better without minute details of plantings, the precise count of herring taken each year, and long segments of background history.

This very excess of detail exposes certain weak and uneven places which may mislead the layman and will distress the historian. Thus Mr. Freeman (III, 136) quotes Henry's "If this be treason make the most of it" speech

with only a reference to the *French Visitor's Diary* made in a way which would lead one to think that it was the authority for this particular version which has, of course, little better ancestry than the cherry tree story. The inclusion of this incident is the more unnecessary because Washington was not present to hear what Henry did say. On the other hand, in dealing with the popular version of Henry's speech of March 23, 1775, which has the same literary origins, Mr. Freeman is careful to describe the sources and warn the unwary.

The reader who tries to follow up Mr. Freeman's footnote references has a difficult time. His system of citing books and manuscript collections is peculiar, and some of the abbreviations in the footnotes cannot be identified in the bibliography at the end of volume four. No references are given for some interesting quotations, and in one case where a facsimile is given as well as the reference, the transcription is poor. In this instance the text quotes a letter as directing Dr. Benjamin Church to send his treasonable correspondence to "Mr. Taphonges farm" (III, 545), although a mere glance at the facsimile a few pages earlier shows the proper reading to be "Mr. Aapthorps farm," a well-known and unexpected point for such activity. These minor failings, and such slips as the misuse of the words "rifle" and "township," are to some degree inevitable in a work of such scope, and although distracting are no ground for distrust of the whole.

For this segment of Washington's life, Mr. Freeman has uncovered no important source material not already available in print. His facts and his interpretation of them contain nothing new to the professional historian. However, anyone seriously interested in Washington should read the historical writings of Bernhard Knollenberg, which badly jolt this orthodox interpretation. Readers who are unfamiliar with Washington's papers and diaries will be amazed at his business activities. He was a considerable industrialist, a manufacturer of flour and sea biscuit, and was a wholesaler at both ends of the fish business. It has long been assumed that his political conduct was influenced by his interest in land speculation, which reached as far as West Florida; but Mr. Freeman pays slight attention to this or to the possible influence of industrial capitalism in making Washington and shaping his mind.

Once he reaches the outbreak of the war, Mr. Freeman drops the excessive recital of background facts and tends to report the struggle through the eyes of his subject. Thus his account of Lexington and Concord (III, 413), printed factually without quotation marks, is the enraged and untrue statement which came to Washington immediately after the battle. The ordinary reader of these volumes will bring away from them much of the misinformation which the participants in the Revolution harbored. Some of the space lavished on the Virginia background could have been used to better advantage at points like this.

Balanced by his Cape Cod ancestry, Mr. Freeman has avoided sectional bias, and is free from ordinary national prejudices as well. He tells of the

bayoneting of the British wounded at Germantown and gives the British generals credit where it is due. He makes it plain that only orders of Congress prevented Washington from burning to the ground the city of New York.

Although this is far from being a debunking biography, it is at times sharply critical of its subject. Of Washington's business, Mr. Freeman remarks that he "was becoming a bit reckless, not to say extravagant. He was not deterred from the purchase of businesses or Negroes by the size of the debt he owed" (III, 111). Again he says of Washington that to him "always the approval and applause of his fellow-men had been the supreme goal of life, next that of acquiring a fortune" (IV, 91). This is not in accord with the general picture which Mr. Freeman draws of his subject, and one dreads to see it taken out of its context and widely quoted.

Although Mr. Freeman would not entirely agree with the reviewer, it seems to the latter that the evidence mustered in these volumes very clearly delineates in this manner the subject at this stage of his career; Washington had exceptional abilities, as his business activities show. He owed his position in public affairs primarily to a political simplicity which enabled him to make an honest and simple statement of popular platitudes. A more brilliant and individualistic man could not have seen things in the same sharp black and white outlines, and, weighing good and evil, could not have held an undeviating course. By his silence, Washington gave the impression of wisdom, and by his unshaken stand he afforded the rallying point without which the Revolution would have failed.

Historians have profitably written volumes on the political philosophy of Adams and Jefferson, but they, including Mr. Freeman, have found none in the Washington of the Revolution. It has been reported that when asked his political opinions he replied, "See the *Virginia Gazette*." A modern American might as well say, "See the *Chicago Tribune*." The fact is that Washington had, in this respect, the type of mind of the modern isolationist. He was continental when men of narrower economic interests were provincial, but he never saw the Empire as a whole. At the present moment when the fate of civilization rests on the issue of nationalism vs. internationalism, it is unfortunate that Washington's newest biographer should share his subject's limited vision, at least so far as the Revolution is concerned. Washington seems never to have realized that as a young man at Great Meadows he had set off a long and dreadful world war, as an aftermath of which some reorganization of the Empire was necessary. Speculators in western lands could no longer be permitted to commit the Empire to such wars; and the colonies must contribute to the expense of their own defence by the royal army and navy, on which they were so quick to call. Washington reproved his friend, Captain Mackenzie of the Regulars, for arguing from effects rather than causes (III, 385), but that was exactly what he himself was doing. The new taxes and the Boston Port Act were effects as well as causes, the effects of political problems arising from the develop-

ment of the Empire. Washington and Freeman believe that the issue in the Revolution was American liberty. In fact, these "infringements on American liberty" were but the mote compared with the beam of the imperial problem. Washington could never understand the lack of patriotism in the army, and indeed throughout the colonies. It was, in fact, because there was no such clear-cut threat to liberty as he saw. That is why during the Revolution there was such a swapping of sides as in no other war in our history. Mr. Freeman dismisses Joseph Galloway and his fellows as "fair-weather friends of American freedom." They were, in fact, souls tortured by the gift of political judgment and perspective, the lack of which was a principal ingredient in Washington's success.

American Antiquarian Society

CLIFFORD K. SHIPTON

George Washington and American Independence. By CURTIS NETTELS. (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1951. [xiv], 338 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$5.00.)

This is a notable year for the publication of books on the Revolution and its great men, particularly Washington and Jefferson. Mr. Nettels' contribution may seem modest beside the multi-volume biographies appearing, but it is a valuable study, distinguished for its penetrating analysis of the motives that impelled Washington to support the cause of independence, for its description of Washington's relations with politicians and soldiers, and for its readability.

Mr. Nettels discusses Washington's motives on the levels of public policy and private interest. Washington strongly objected to Parliament's asserted right to tax the colonies, from which he thought the main troubles of the colonies flowed. He considered, too, that the ministry's measures indicated a design to impose an arbitrary government on the colonies. Holding British merchants largely responsible for his own business troubles, he switched his emphasis from the hazards of raising tobacco to investment in western lands. Even here he knocked his head against the policy of the Crown when the British detached from Virginia the lands north of the Ohio and thereby made impossible the development of one of his choicest tracts. As Mr. Nettels avers, "Washington's experience with British policies was such as to exasperate a patient man." On personal as well as public grounds, he could see little advantage in continuing the existing relationship with Britain, and was among the first of the great figures of the Revolution to advocate independence. Throughout this discussion Mr. Nettels maintains an admirable balance; he could so easily have distorted the perspective by overemphasizing the degree to which Washington permitted his personal interests to govern his judgment of public affairs.

One of the most valuable parts of the book is Mr. Nettels' consideration of Washington's relations with Congress and his officers. Washington was

the ideal man to deal with a body so suspicious of the military. Patient and tactful toward Congress, he used members sympathetic with the army to act as his spokesmen, and, with support from the moderate and militant factions, he secured approval of his policies. It was therefore no coincidence that he gave to the first vessels he acquired as a navy the names of *Hancock*, *Harrison*, and *Lynch* for the moderates, and *Franklin*, *Lee*, and *Warren* for the militants. He gave timely aid to these groups in Congress, making it clear in his correspondence that it was against "the king's troops" that he was fighting. Thus by implication he declared the King to be the enemy, a cue that Congress promptly picked up.

His relations with his generals called for a treatment hardly less delicate. Schuyler needed constant encouragement, and Washington supported him warmly. He recognized the talents of Charles Lee, but, as Mr. Nettels demonstrates, he did not permit Lee to gain ascendancy over him. Unfortunately, Mr. Nettels fails to bring out in full measure the pressure to which Washington was subjected in coping with Lee's popularity and inflated reputation in the colonies. With Gates, Washington enjoyed at this stage a most agreeable relationship, with no hint of future discord. According to John Adams, the commander in chief personally requested Gates as his adjutant general.

But admirable as this book is, there are flaws. Mr. Nettels devotes far too many pages at the beginning to the English background of the Revolution, a consideration that could properly have been reserved for a totally different study; one has to wait for forty-seven pages even to come across the name of Washington. Furthermore, in this section, which is concerned with an examination of British government and society, Mr. Nettels writes in an extraordinarily acidulous vein for a historian usually so judicious. A minor defect, occasionally annoying, is that throughout the book he overworks a penchant for quotations. The value of many of these would not have been sacrificed had they been summarized in Mr. Nettels' clear, fluent, and deceptively simple style, a style that is a delight to read. Notwithstanding these criticisms, Mr. Nettels' book is a fine study, written with a lively appreciation of both the scholar's needs and the layman's taste. It may well have, and surely merits, a popular reception.

Wesleyan University

WILLARD M. WALLACE

The Navigation Acts and the American Revolution. By OLIVER M. DICKERSON. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951. xvi, 344 p. Tables, bibliography, index. \$6.00.)

Scholars owe Professor Dickerson great thanks for his Herculean labors not only in reviewing the pamphlet literature and newspapers of the period, but also in poring over the Treasury statistics and papers. Henceforth, no one should write on the subject without consulting this volume.

The Navigation Acts were not a simple series of measures the effects of which are easy to describe. They were a complex, involving many commodities, all of which must be studied in detail. Anyone may find statements in the book with which he disagrees, but he will also discover much he needs to know.

My major disagreement is with Dickerson's contention that the entrepôt provisions of the Acts were not burdensome to the colonists. They themselves thought otherwise even when they accepted the Acts as the price to be paid for protection. The export bounties and debentures, the drawbacks and liberal credits which Dickerson stresses lightened but did not eliminate the burden of confining colonial purchases to Britain. Americans virtually ceased to buy European manufactures there after independence. Even exports of British products fell off, despite established consumer habits, commercial connections, and the Industrial Revolution in England (R. B. Morris, ed., *The Era of the American Revolution*, 11).

Britain helped find markets for products like tobacco and rice, but the price was too great. When free to do so, Americans shipped directly to the ultimate consumer. The failure of postrevolutionary exports to maintain an upward spiral can be explained on other grounds than change of market practices. L. C. Gray's *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860* (II, 606-609, 723-726, 760-765) shows that American consumption of both commodities increased. In Virginia and Maryland grain increasingly replaced tobacco. In South Carolina a developing cotton culture provided abundant profits with fewer risks to a slave's health than work in rice swamps. The French Revolution and Napoleonic wars increased foreign competition. In 1839 East India rice was competing in the markets of Charleston itself. By 1840 Europe grew more tobacco than the colonies had ever produced under England.

Professor Dickerson sometimes overstates his case. He is on dangerous ground when arguing that shipowners were justified in continuing during wartime to trade with the French West Indies because they had done so in peacetime. It was unnecessary and erroneous to contend that during the French and Indian War the New Englanders were supporting essentially a foreign war; contemporary literature shows that they themselves wanted to drive the French from America. It goes too far to state that "none of the new exactions and demands for arbitrary authority had any relation to the trade and navigation law" (p. 299). Britain's desire to gain revenue was coupled with an interest in perfecting the old mercantilist code. The new rules were designed for that end; the trouble is that ruthlessly applied they injured innocent and guilty alike.

Nonetheless, Dickerson's main points are sound and should win adherents. British mercantilism provided a system under which both Britain and the colonies flourished. The laws, except those regulating molasses and tea, were reasonably well enforced. The colonists accepted them. Colonial opposition was directed against the new revenue measures and newly applied

administrative techniques which upset well-established trade practices. Insofar as the Navigation Acts per se helped precipitate the Revolution, it was because partisan charges that Americans opposed them aroused British fears and gained support for ill-advised measures. To which I would add that the entrepôt policy helped to drain the colonies of specie and thus made for general colonial irritability.

Before closing special thanks are due Dickerson for stressing the fact that *how* laws are administered is as important as *what* they provide. The late C. M. Andrews long ago stressed the importance of this factor with respect to the American Revolution (Colonial Society of Massachusetts, *Transactions*, XIX, 159-259), but few historians heeded his words. Perhaps Dickerson's graphic examples of revenue racketeering will attract more attention.

University of California

LAWRENCE A. HARPER

Thomas Pownall, British Defender of American Liberty. A Study of Anglo-American Relations in the Eighteenth Century. By JOHN A. SCHUTZ. [Old Northwest Historical Series, V.] (Glendale, Calif.: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1951. 340 p. Illustrations, maps, index. \$10.00.)

The long life of Thomas Pownall extended from 1722 to 1805. Scion of a family of the lesser country gentry, he was ambitious to attain a position in the political life of the nation commensurate with those abilities which he not unreasonably thought of himself as possessing. Despairing of a direct invasion of the tight monopoly on political power enjoyed by the Whig oligarchy, Pownall sought to obtain his objective through the flank operation of forging for himself a career in the colonial service. After completing his studies at Cambridge, he served for several years in the office of the Board of Trade where his younger brother John was already established, and then took service as "Secretary Extraordinary" under Sir Danvers Osborne, who had been appointed Governor of New York. When Osborne's suicide left Pownall stranded in North America he decided to make capital of this dilemma, and devoted himself to traveling around the country and making the acquaintance of Americans in all walks of life. In this manner he obtained an intimate knowledge of the American colonies unique among Englishmen of his generation. He met Sir William Johnson, William Shirley, James DeLancey and Benjamin Franklin, and collaborated with Lewis Evans on his celebrated map of the colonies and the analysis which accompanied it. Participating semiofficially in the war preparations mounting against France, he became involved, apparently willingly, in the dispute between Lord Loudoun and Governor Shirley of Massachusetts. The removal of Shirley from office and his replacement by Pownall seems to have been in accordance with the latter's plans. As war governor of the Bay Colony, Pownall was confronted by that perennial paradox of the colonial executive, his dual status as chief magistrate of a people and as representa-

tive of that multiplicity of British interests which took refuge under the symbol of the Crown. The war crisis sharpened the edge of his problems, but also afforded him a special opportunity for convincing the colonists of the substantial measure of identity existing between their interests and those of the mother country. Pownall knew better than to hector and bully the Assembly. He sought rather to broaden the basis of consent by establishing his power upon the good will of the governed. He had substantial success in bringing the resources of Massachusetts into the war effort. He also took advantage of the military situation to extend the frontier of settlement northward. The triumph of British arms may have made his role as Governor of Massachusetts somewhat anticlimactic or he may have felt that the prospects for self-advancement were better elsewhere. On the other hand, the authorities at home may have become convinced that he had identified himself too closely with colonial interests to continue adequately to represent the Crown in the Bay Colony. At all events, Pownall was transferred to the governorship of South Carolina, the duties of which he never assumed. Instead, he returned to England, sought unsuccessfully to obtain a post with the colonial administration there, and attempted with but little more success to impress his ideas of colonial policy upon the administration. These ideas were liberal. Pownall was realist and patriot enough not to wish to sweep the old system away overnight, but he leaned toward a laissez-faire philosophy and felt that the constitutional basis of empire should be thoroughly revised. Here he was disposed to favor some form of imperial federation or, failing that, a clearer definition of the rights and obligations of the home and colonial governments respectively. These views found their fullest expression in Pownall's *Administration of the Colonies*. First appearing in 1764, this work ran through six editions, in each of which the author brought his ideas up to date. From 1767 to 1780 Pownall sat in the House of Commons. Colonial affairs were his principal interest, and his speeches were usually in criticism of government policy. It is true that having been defeated in 1774 he accepted a seat from the North administration, but this seems to have compromised relatively little the essential independence of his attitude. Throughout the rest of his life he remained an active student and expositor of colonial problems, embracing in his later purview the colonies of Spain, whose independence he foresaw and advocated.

The task of the author of the present volume would have been rendered easier had he been able to discover extant archives of the Pownall family. Nothing of the sort seems to exist, and he has had to find his manuscript materials in some two dozen repositories in this country, Canada, and Britain. He has, of course, also used the sources available in print. This material, obviously gathered with much labor and care, has been intelligently synthesized and interestingly presented. It is possibly the lack of Pownall's own papers which has made it a little bit difficult to present Pownall as a man. One glimpses here at times a Pownall ambitious for self-advancement, though more frequently a Pownall who is an enlightened

idealist striving hard for the public good, but somehow the two pictures fail to fuse into a portrait. One could wish too, that at times the author had dug a little deeper below the surface. One is not quite satisfied, for example, with his treatment of the termination of Pownall's Massachusetts governorship, a treatment which indeed insofar as Pownall's future plans are concerned seems to contradict itself. Other minor contradictions are to be found elsewhere, together with occasional lapses in syntax and spelling. This last may be due to oversights of the proofreader, or perchance to that subtle influence which is apt to affect anyone who submerges himself to any great depth in the orthographic anarchy of the eighteenth century. But these minor defects do little to detract from the essential value of a work which was badly needed, needed because the only other attempt to write a full-length biography, that by C. A. W. Pownall which appeared in 1908, while more detailed than Dr. Schutz's treatment, is based on a much more restricted investigation of the sources and is too subjective in interpretation. The present volume is handsomely printed and bound, with a portrait of Pownall and the reproduction of some sketches which this amazingly versatile individual made of the America that he knew.

University of Pennsylvania

LEONIDAS DODSON

Crisis in Freedom: The Alien and Sedition Acts. By JOHN C. MILLER. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1951. 253 p. Bibliography, index. \$3.50.)

With the same thoroughness of research and felicity in composition shown in his *Origins of the American Revolution* and *Triumph of Freedom*, John C. Miller, Professor of History at Stanford University, has produced a most readable book on the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. These acts were passed by the Federalist majorities in the Congress in an excess of zeal at a time when they were triumphant in the country at large because of certain machinations of the French Directory known as the XYZ Affair. These same acts, however, contributed to the downfall of the Federalists in the 1800 presidential election, after which they disintegrated and eventually disappeared as a party.

The Alien Act of June 25, 1798 (1 U.S. Stat. at Large 570) authorized the President of the United States to order any alien he judged dangerous to the peace of the country to leave the United States within such time as the President should direct. The President was further authorized to license aliens to remain, upon their giving bond. In case any alien sent out of the country returned without the permission of the President, he was subject on conviction to imprisonment for as long as the President thought the public safety required. Masters of vessels entering any port of the country were required to report to the Collector of Customs the names of all aliens on board their vessels. The Circuit and District Courts of the United States

were given jurisdiction for all offenses against the act, which was to continue in force for two years.

The Sedition Act of July 14, 1798 (1 U.S. Stat. at Large 596) provided that any persons conspiring to oppose any measure of the government, to impede the operation of any law of the United States, or to intimidate or prevent any person holding an office under the government from performing his duties, or any persons advising or attempting riot or insurrection or unlawful assemblage, should be guilty of a high misdemeanor and on conviction in a Federal court should be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 and imprisonment for not less than six months and not exceeding five years. It further provided that if any person should write, print, utter or publish any false, scandalous, or malicious writing against the government, Congress, or the President, he should be subject to a fine not exceeding \$2,000 and imprisonment not exceeding two years, but on trial the truth of the matter could be given in evidence as a defense. This act was to continue until March 3, 1801.

As Mr. Miller points out, there is no record of any actual prosecution under the Alien Act, although the French General, Jean Baptiste Collot, who was in the country and suspected of intriguing to establish an independent French-sponsored state in the West, was obliged to go into hiding. On the other hand, about twenty-five persons were indicted under the Sedition Act, but less than a dozen of them were actually brought to trial. The chief offender was Benjamin Franklin Bache, the fiery editor of the Democratic-Republican *Aurora*, who had inherited at least some of the intellectual brilliance of his distinguished grandfather, but who lacked his poise and common sense. Bache's vituperations against the Federalists were so extreme that even before the Sedition bill was enacted he was arrested on a common law charge of having libeled the President and of exciting sedition. Bache escaped trial by dying of yellow fever in the epidemic of 1798. John Daly Burk, an Irish firebrand, was arraigned under the Sedition Act for writing in *Time Piece*, a New York sheet, that the reported landing of the French in Ireland was but a prelude to a French invasion of America, in which every scoundrel in the government would be put to the guillotine. Burk's bail was furnished by Aaron Burr and negotiations were pending to compromise the matter by his agreeing to leave the country at the expense of the government; when Secretary of State Pickering turned this plan down, Burk fled to Virginia, where Thomas Jefferson had offered asylum to those exposed to the penalties of the acts and his trial never took place. Another agitator who was actually tried and convicted was Matthew Lyon, the stormy petrel from Vermont, whose physical melees on the floor of Congress with Griswold of Connecticut led to an attempt to expel him from Congress, and whose newspaper articles resulted in his arrest, trial, and conviction, all of which boomeranged, for he was re-elected to Congress while serving his sentence.

As Mr. Miller points out, the acts were not precisely administration

measures. Their passage was opposed by Alexander Hamilton who, although out of office, was the real leader of the Federalists, and they had not been recommended by President Adams. Their chief advocate in the administration was Secretary of State Pickering. In Congress, Harrison Gray Otis and Robert G. Harper were especially active. Other leading Federalists, such as Fisher Ames and Gouverneur Morris, strongly urged enactment.

Loud were the outcries of the opposition party on the passage of the acts, and Jefferson, the guiding spirit of the opposition, promptly entered the lists. He framed the famous Kentucky Resolutions passed by the legislature of that state on November 14, 1798, a copy of which Jefferson sent to Madison, who, acting on the hint, rewrote them; they were passed by Virginia on December 24, 1798. These almost identical resolutions set forth the "compact" theory of the relation of the states to the Federal government and had a far greater effect on the future politics of the country than the two acts which inspired them. This comment seems justified in view of the fact that Mr. Miller, like other historians, does no more than assert that the Alien and Sedition laws were but one of the factors contributing to the defeat of President Adams for re-election in 1800. Equally important factors were Adams' dismissals of Pickering as Secretary of State and of McHenry as Secretary of War and Hamilton's printed pamphlet severely castigating Adams, a copy of which fell into the hands of Burr, who promptly broadcast it. In short, the Federalist Party was torn wide asunder. Despite this, the 1800 election was not an overwhelming victory for the opposition. Jefferson and Burr each had 73 electoral votes (throwing the election into the House of Representatives), while Adams had 65 and his colleague, Pinckney, 64. This was not much of a shift in the electoral vote from 1796, when Adams had 71 and Jefferson 68. It is an interesting speculation, and it never can be anything else, whether the opposition to the Alien and Sedition laws or the exposure of the Federalist quarrels among themselves was the greater factor in the defeat.

It is interesting to note that the basic features of both the Alien and Sedition Acts, namely, "treasonable machinations" against the government and attempts to stir up sedition, are to be found in the present Nationality Code of 1940 and in the Immigration Act of the same year, but the vice of the Alien Act was the uncontrolled discretion given the President to banish aliens whom he considered dangerous to the peace of the country, and of the Sedition Act that it was intended to be used and was used to stifle all criticism of the actions of the Federalists. The power given the President by the Alien Act was not unlike the provision of the National Recovery Act of 1933, which authorized the President to establish a code or codes of fair competition in trade and industry and which the Supreme Court in the *Schechter Case*, 295 U.S. 495 (1935) held to be unconstitutional as an improper delegation of legislative power. On the other hand, the Act of June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 808, known as the "Smith Act," making it unlawful to advocate the overthrow of the government by force, has been upheld

by the courts: *United States v. Dennis, et al.*, 183 F. 2d, 201 (1950); 341 U.S. 494 (1950). The fundamental difference between the Alien Act and the Smith Act is that the latter provides for indictment and trial.

Mr. Miller's text, like those of his other books, is delightful reading, punctuated with occasional humor, and historically accurate, with (so far as this reviewer can discern) only one error. Richard Peters is referred to several times as a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, which he was not. He was a judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania from 1792 to 1828. It is a human failing of the tribe of reviewers that they find such slips.

Philadelphia

BOYD LEE SPAHR

The Papers of Henry Bouquet. Volume II: The Forbes Expedition. Edited by S. K. STEVENS, DONALD H. KENT, AUTUMN L. LEONARD. (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1951. xxxiv, 704 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$7.00.)

The publication of this volume, which covers the period June 1 to December 31, 1758, is a signal achievement of sound scholarship. Between 1940 and 1943 nineteen mimeographed volumes, based upon collections made under WPA auspices, were prepared by the present editors. Since that time the search has been continued for additional Bouquet papers. The present volume, the first to be published, precedes volume one because the editors believe that further search may bring to light additional papers relating to the earliest period of Bouquet's military services in Pennsylvania.

Whatever Colonel Henry Bouquet's position in military history may be thought to have been, it is clear from this volume that he was the most important figure in the campaign which led to the capture of Fort Duquesne on November 24, 1758. Brigadier General John Forbes was ill and unable to take active command of the expedition until the very end when there was no longer any need of his presence at the head of the army. Forbes, to be sure, had to make the final decision concerning the route that was to be followed, but it was Bouquet who made that decision possible. The capture of Fort Duquesne was Bouquet's victory.

Several features relating to editorial policy deserve attention. Contrary to usual practice in the publication of such papers, there are included here important related materials in addition to letters to and from Bouquet. Since the intention of the editors is obviously to make intelligible the campaign of 1758, this additional material is not only welcome but necessary. Some papers, on the other hand, have been omitted because they are considered to be unimportant or of little interest. Each one is noted and an abstract is given instead. Where the editors have not found certain letters they have nevertheless given both headings and abstracts whenever it has been possible to conjecture the contents. Consequently a much clearer picture emerges of the progress of the campaign.

Faithful translations follow the longer letters written in French by Bouquet to Forbes. The editors have avoided the sin of unnecessary repetition in footnotes and have explained only those matters which seem to be obscure. Chronologies appear at the beginning of each month, and a list of letters chronologically arranged follows the foreword. The index, covering proper names, is less adequate than might be desired. The bibliography is excellent and useful. A colored portrait of Bouquet appears as the frontispiece. Other illustrations include a portrait of Forbes, and maps and plans. As in most works of this kind, however, there is missing what would be of greatest usefulness, even to the scholar, a modern map of the area giving both the older and present-day names. Perhaps such a map can be prepared for volume one.

These papers bring to light certain attitudes and problems which give an insight not only into the military campaign of 1758, but also into the relations between professional soldiers and American colonials. Washington emerges as a man of dogged tenacity who holds out for following Braddock's route instead of building a new road over difficult terrain through virgin country. He recommends Indian dress for soldiers as being more practicable than the uniforms then in use, since Indian dress was easy to procure and military uniforms were not. Bouquet, not yet fully aware of the factors which made campaigning in America different from Europe, is distressed to find that road-making took the major part of the army's time. Flexible as he was in his approach to military requirements in a new environment, he criticizes Washington for not knowing the difference between a force and an army. Perhaps it is not too much to say that in the Bouquet papers one can trace some of the dissonances which came to a head in the Revolution a few years later.

New York State Historian

ALBERT B. COREY

The Papers of Sir William Johnson. Volume X. Prepared for publication by MILTON W. HAMILTON and ALBERT B. COREY. (Albany, N. Y.: The University of the State of New York, 1951. xiv, 998 p. Illustrations. \$5.00.)

The publication of the Sir William Johnson Papers was begun in 1921 by The University of the State of New York and continued through eight volumes of documents chronologically arranged. During the period in which these volumes appeared, extensive searches for additional Johnson material uncovered enough manuscripts to fill another four volumes. The first of these supplemental volumes, volume nine, was published in 1939 and covers the period 1738 to August, 1758. After a lapse of twelve years volume ten has now appeared. The 998 pages of this latest addition to the series contain Johnson manuscripts covering the period September, 1758, through December, 1763. It parallels the time span of parts of volumes three and four, and nearly doubles the amount of material for the above period.

Few of the papers contained in the new volume have ever been printed before. In addition to numerous minutes of Indian conferences and journals and reports on Indian affairs, it includes letters which passed between Johnson and many of the key figures of his day. The great majority of these letters were exchanges with such military leaders as Abercromby, Gates, Stanwix, Amherst, Gladwin, Haldemand and Monckton; with political leaders like James DeLancey and Cadwallader Colden of New York, James Hamilton and Richard Peters of Pennsylvania, and Horatio Sharpe of Maryland. Indian agents are well represented by a large correspondence with George Croghan and Daniel Claus. Other lesser figures in the orbit of Johnson's activities whose letters are of interest include John and Guy Johnson, John and Thomas Butler, Peter Wraxall, Jelles Fonda, Thomas Hutchins and Alexander McKee. There is even a message addressed to Teedyuscung, and his answer.

With the exception of the Revolutionary movement, no more fascinating or active five years in our colonial history can be cited than those covered by this notable collection of documents. This period saw the fall of forts Duquesne and Niagara, of Quebec and of Canada herself, an event which many historians claim to be of greater significance than the American Revolution, since it delivered the destinies of our continent into Anglo-Saxon hands. The period also covers several subsequent years of western readjustment, which culminated in failure with the tragic Pontiac uprising. Much correspondence of vital significance on these subjects has been gathered together to make volume ten one of exceptional importance.

The editors have decided, and I think wisely, to follow closely the format of the earlier volumes. They present the material purely as source material, and leave its evaluation to the reader. The primary target in their effort has been to discover and to print every possible Johnson document. Some aids, however, are furnished. Proper names and place names are identified, references in the letters are often explained by a cross reference to another letter, handwriting is identified when significant, mention is made of documents previously printed, and in all cases the location of the original document is given. The net effect of the volume is pleasing. It is printed in a large and legible type and contains twelve illustrations, notable among them being Benjamin West's magnificent portrait of Guy Johnson, and Copley's portrait of Thomas Gage.

Readers will continue to sigh for an index. The series now includes about ten thousand pages of highly important historical data, but aside from the chronological arrangement, lacks any sort of aid in finding desired material. It is greatly to be hoped that present plans for an index volume will bear fruit.

Volume ten has been prepared for publication by Milton W. Hamilton, Senior Historian, and Albert B. Corey, State Historian, of New York. Their efforts, and in particular the work of Dr. Hamilton not only in discovering new material but in checking every item against the original, have produced

a highly accurate and thorough coverage. A great mass of papers of the utmost consequence to historians, papers without which many aspects of our colonial history cannot be adequately comprehended, have thus been made available in an authoritative way. The editors and New York are to be congratulated on a splendid piece of work.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania NICHOLAS B. WAINWRIGHT

Letters from America, 1773-1780. Being the letters of a Scots officer, Sir James Murray, to his home during the War for American Independence. Edited by ERIC ROBSON. (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1951. xxvi, 90 p. Frontispiece, bibliography, index. \$3.25.)

This volume consists of twenty-three letters from Sir James Murray to his sister, Elizabeth (Betty) Murray Smyth, and one to her husband, David Smyth, together with an admirable biographical sketch of Murray. The letters, running from 1773 to 1780, are copiously and, with trifling exceptions, accurately annotated by Mr. Robson—annotations which add much to their interest and value.

To the American reader, the chief interest will be eleven letters written in North America between July 7, 1776, and October 24, 1778, the first from near Charleston, S. C., the last from New York City. Murray, a Scotch baronet, captain in the 57th Regiment of Foot stationed in Ireland, embarked with his regiment for North America on February 12, 1776, destined for the lower Cape Fear region of North Carolina.

The first of the letters from America here published—the letter of July 7, 1776—is dated from Long Island near the mouth of Charleston harbor. We learn from it that Murray set sail from Cape Fear for the Charleston region about May 28, and, from other sources, that the expedition, or part of it, was off Charleston harbor by June first. Because of various incidents and mistakes explained by Murray in passages that contribute much to the interest of the letter, the attack was not made until June 28.

The 57th and other troops were prepared to land on Sullivan's Island from nearby Long Island, where they had been stationed for more than two weeks, as soon as the fleet had silenced the batteries at Fort Sullivan. But though, as Murray writes his sister, "the Light Infantry and Grenadiers were in the boats," ready to make the first landing, the order to attack was not issued, because Commodore Sir Peter Parker's fleet was badly shattered by the garrison at Fort Sullivan (later Fort Moultrie) on Sullivan's Island athwart the entrance to Charleston's inner harbor. By the date of Murray's letter, the decision had been made not to attack again, but to proceed to New York. The British had evidently been much impressed by their reception: Murray remarked that "The gentlemen who have undertaken to conquer America with single regiments might . . . [have made] some few observations in this camp: that the artillery of the *Yankies* was admirably

well served, their works admirably constructed, and we had not a single deserter [from the Americans] for three weeks."

The next letter, dated August 31, 1776, from Long Island, New York, had a more cheerful—from Murray's standpoint—story to tell. The force under Clinton had arrived at New York harbor about August first, in ample time to share in Howe's great victory over the Americans at the battle of Long Island on August 27, which Murray describes in interesting detail. The next two letters (February 25 and May 30), from New Jersey, contain valuable accounts of brushes with the rebels before the opposing main armies had taken the field for the 1777 campaign. The next letter, dated September 1, 1777, is from the Head of Elk, Maryland, near the head of Chesapeake Bay, where the 57th along with most of Howe's army had landed a week earlier for a descent on Philadelphia. "They say," wrote Murray, that Washington "threatens to fight rather than give up Philadelphia. If he risks an engagement in any accessible situation it will be a sign that he thinks his cause in a very desperate situation, or that he is very little acquainted with the nature of the troops that are to act for and against him."

The next three letters (October 30, 1777, to March 5, 1778) are from Philadelphia, which the British occupied for some months after defeating Washington at the Brandywine. Unfortunately, Murray did not give his impressions of that battle or of the succeeding one at Germantown; but his letters throw interesting light on life in Philadelphia during the fall and winter of 1777-1778. The last two letters from North America (August 10 and October 22, 1778), written from the vicinity of New York City, deal largely with Murray's successful negotiations for the purchase of a commission as major in the Fourth Regiment of Foot, which cost him £2,050 sterling. The second of them was written when he was on board ship bound for an attack on the French island of St. Lucia in the West Indies, which was occupied by the British in December, 1778.

In stressing the interest of the letters from North America I do not mean to imply that the others, from the continent of Europe, Scotland, Ireland and the West Indies, are uninteresting. They are, in fact, quite the contrary. Murray, who had a keen eye for detail, writes with judgment and discrimination, and the full, careful editorial comment of Mr. Robson enables the reader, however uninitiated, to follow what young Murray—he was probably twenty years old when the letters begin—finds of interest to relate.

The index is good and the bibliography is valuable, particularly to an American reader, because of the inclusion of numerous titles published in England and little known on this side of the water, bearing on the American Revolution.

Henry Hamilton and George Rogers Clark in the American Revolution with the Unpublished Journal of Lieut. Gov. Henry Hamilton. By JOHN D. BARNHART. (Crawfordsville, Ind.: R. E. Banta, 1951. 244 p. Frontispiece, note on sources, index. \$5.00.)

In the opinion of the patriots of the Revolution Lieutenant Governor Henry Hamilton of Detroit, the "Hair-Buyer General," was a villain who exultingly sent war parties of Indians and Tories against the American frontier settlements and who eagerly purchased scalps of men, women, and children from Britain's red-skinned allies. He was looked upon as a scoundrel more depraved than General Charles "No-Flint" Grey, Banastre Tarleton, and Provost William Cunningham. When he was brought to Williamsburg in the summer of 1779, after his capture at Vincennes by George Rogers Clark, he was tossed into a dungeon by order of Governor Thomas Jefferson and the council of Virginia. There he remained during many months, for Jefferson thought him to be a rascal deserving the most severe punishment and denied pleas from both British and American officers that he be treated like other prisoners. However, the British threatened reprisals, and it could not be proved conclusively that Hamilton was a brute. In the summer of 1780 he was removed to a more comfortable jail, and he was soon afterward paroled and then exchanged. American historians have commonly dealt rather sternly with Hamilton, although they have not recently given full credence to the accusations laid against him by his enemies. They have also been inclined to use him as a foil to emphasize the genius and courage of his captor, George Rogers Clark.

Professor Barnhart has investigated Hamilton's career, making effective use of a hitherto unexploited journal kept by the British officer during the period August, 1778-June, 1779. The journal is published for the first time in this volume. The result is a very attractive book that adds materially to our knowledge of the American Revolution.

Professor Barnhart does not believe that Hamilton was an infamous person. He points out that the British and their Indian friends committed more and greater atrocities on the American frontier after Hamilton's capture than before it. He thinks the British officer was "callous to the inevitable barbarism of the warriors and the cruel suffering inherent in their methods of warfare," but points out that "the charge that he bought scalps lacks proof." There is no doubt that Hamilton inspired Indian raids, no question that he gave presents to the warriors who made them. Nevertheless, the author sees him as "a brave, honest, and honorable man." The reviewer, perhaps influenced by the fact that atrocities have become commonplace in the twentieth century, finds no very good reason to question this bit of characterization by Professor Barnhart. Even if Hamilton bought scalps, he was possibly not outside the pale, for American colonials officially offered rewards for the scalps of hostile Indians and doubtless knowingly paid for the hair of Frenchmen on occasion. In 1760 South Carolina was paying £35 (provincial currency) per enemy Cherokee scalp.

The author portrays Hamilton as a man of mediocre abilities, George Rogers Clark as something less than a hero "with halo and wings." He does not look upon Clark's capture of Hamilton and Fort Sackville as a miracle. Clark emerges as a bold, persevering, and able leader, who was harsh and possibly brutal in his dealings with his British and Indian enemies, more human than in earlier accounts, but still a great figure.

Professor Barnhart's book is valuable because it offers new and sound interpretations, also because it makes Hamilton's journal for 1778-1779 fascinating reading, available in print for the first time.

University of Nebraska

JOHN RICHARD ALDEN

Prices and Inflation During the American Revolution: Pennsylvania, 1770-1790. By ANNE BEZANSON. Assisted by BLANCHE DALEY, MARJORIE C. DENISON and MIRIAM HUSSEY. [Industrial Research Department, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, Research Studies, XXXV.] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951. xvi, 362 p. Tables, charts, bibliography, index. \$6.75.)

The successive "lost generations" since World War I have experienced such a wide variety of price levels that it has been possible to write price history for comparatively remote decades in almost contemporary terms. In the mid-thirties when Miss Bezanson and her associates, who included Miss Hussey, issued their studies of Philadelphia prices for the colonial period and for the years 1784-1861, they were working in the shadow of 1929, and their treatment of prices over cycles of prosperity and depression had, for all its statistical and historical objectivity, a certain immediacy. The volume now under review, the hitherto missing link between their previous publications, deals essentially with the single illustration in our national history of a galloping inflation, the course of prices during the American Revolution. At the height of the upward movement the price curve increased in a month 45%, and in a single year, 439%. In 1780-1781 there came a shattering monetary deflation, and by 1787 the average of wholesale prices was back to its prewar level. Though the parallelism is far from exact, the current interest of this experience is obvious.

In execution this volume differs substantially from its companions. There is, of course, the same resourceful and expert use of statistical tools to determine what actually happened to prices. Once again the usual curves and charts summarize so delusively in terms of space uncelebrated hours of research and calculation. As in the volume on the colonial era there are chapters on the price trends for about twenty important commodities. But Miss Bezanson has gone beyond this customary base to describe the currency experiments, which along with war shortages, led to inflation and the occasional attempt to control prices and the very modern-sounding devices

used to outwit regulations. Finally, the volume seeks to understand how Pennsylvania survived an inflation which would bankrupt a modern community. The answer was an economy in which individuals or small groups were self-sufficient and in which there was the employment of payments in kind, of barter, and of other devices, which spread the impact of inflation to the community as a whole rather than concentrating it upon certain occupational groups.

The narrative spreads out from the merchant class which is its center and from trading activities as stated in pounds and shillings. As anyone raised in a small town knows, balance sheets and inventory accounts reveal in sometimes too candid a fashion the lives of individual customers. A steady series of orders for charged water shows that Jones is "drinking too much," and a purchase of roast beef is a portent that the Smiths are entertaining the high brass and not the lower echelons, or wienie-roast crowd. These price series operate in the same human fashion. From them the reader can learn of the concealed manipulation of iron prices, the effect of nonimportation agreements, the details of the army ration, changes in trade routes, and even something about the pervasive influence of habit and ideals. As one merchant wrote in 1788: "This seems to be the age for discouraging slavery and the use of spirituous liquors. We think that unless you can ship your rum and that of a good quality at or under two shillings three pence per gallon, it will not answer to ship to this market." Through details, trivial or cosmic, Miss Bezanson, Miss Hussey, and others, have picked their sure-footed way. It is safe to say that they know more about Philadelphia merchants than the merchants knew themselves. In a business deal I would match them, if not against Robert Morris, at least against Henry Drinker and the rest of the mercantile tribe.

Bowdoin College

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND

The Jeffersonians. A Study in Administrative History, 1801-1829. By LEONARD D. WHITE. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. xvi, 572 p. Index. \$6.00.)

Professor Leonard D. White's writings upon the administrative system of the early government of the United States have impressed the reviewer as some of the finest scholarship of this generation in the realm of the social sciences. Many features of his work—*The Federalists* (1948) and *The Jeffersonians* (1951)—compel such an impression. The originality of objective, the intricate precision of organization, the copious use of source material, the familiarity with recent scholarship, the careful documentation, the brilliant selection of typical examples in support of theses, the thrifty exactitude of statement, the rich human interest with which the author endows institutional activities, and the restraint of his conclusions, all con-

tribute to it. In *The Jeffersonians* one continually senses a reserve power of proof, and recognizes a mind so familiar with the area of exploration that it could readily expand any paragraph into a chapter if there were any reason to do so. The result is a book in which it is a joy to read any chapter, but which cannot comfortably be read in a few sittings because of the continual mental exercise required of the reader. It is a book to be read slowly, a book to be studied, a book in which each unit stimulates new ideas and deserves contemplation.

The thirty-five chapters, although listed serially, represent five major divisions of the study: the Presidency; Congress; the cabinet offices; miscellaneous problems of administration such as personnel, career work, and public service ethics; and finally, administrative problems related to specific contemporary events such as the embargo, Indian activities, internal improvements, public land sale, the management of the militia, and others. In this comprehensive treatment there is necessarily some overlapping both of facts and conclusions, but the result is rather to arouse interest in new relationships than to suggest mere duplication.

Two areas of inquiry which one might expect to find in the chapter sequence are not included: the court system and the War of 1812. The war was excluded as a topic presumably because it affected every branch of government administration. References to it and illustrations drawn from it are found in nearly every chapter. Why the judicial system, as such, was not taken up is less clear.

One of the most fascinating aspects of Professor White's work is that so much of his material is directly applicable to current affairs. Administrative problems have their roots in human nature; they reflect points of view and types of resistance which are timeless. For example, consider the comment, made in 1822, on Congressional committees: "the duties should be performed in the early part of the session, that the legislature may thereby be able to correct abuses, if they exist, and if they do not, to remove unfounded causes of distrust, and restore the public confidence; for, next to the evil of having a wasteful and corrupt government is the belief that we have one" (p. 106). Or, the conclusions flowing from a study of efforts to reduce government expenditures in 1828: "First, the rate of expenditure could be substantially reduced by Congress if it was prepared to cut substantive programs. Second, no department was likely to admit in response to a questionnaire that it was either inefficient or uneconomical. Third, it was easier to reduce substantive programs when no important group outside the government was adversely affected" (p. 124).

Professor White's general conclusion is that, regardless of any revolution of principles in 1800, "the Republicans brought no revolution in administration. They found a system in full order; the people were familiar with its operations; it was well adapted to the work to be done; and it was taken over with hardly a ripple and maintained substantially intact for over a quarter of a century" (p. 546). Such changes as took place were changes of

emphasis, the most important being a revival of the idea of the responsibility of the executive branch to Congress. Lesser changes concerned the administrative reorganization or the expansion of the several cabinet offices. Such alterations of the administrative system, however, were not produced by political policy, but rather were "the product of mere growth of population and area, and of the impact of the war crisis of 1812-1815. In both cases circumstances forced the hand of the government, rather than Republican antipathy to Federalist patterns of organization and administration" (p. 558).

The Pennsylvania State College

PHILIP S. KLEIN

Portraits in Delaware, 1700-1850. A Check List Compiled by the National Society of Colonial Dames of America in the State of Delaware. (Wilmington, Del.: National Society of Colonial Dames of America in the State of Delaware, 1951. 176 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$4.00.)

"Drawing is a most ingenious, interesting, and elegant art . . . of all others this art has the greatest number of admirers; and no wonder, since in a kind of universal language or living history understood by all mankind, it represents to our view the forms of innumerable objects, which we should be otherwise deprived of" (James Smither, *Independent Gazetteer*, Philadelphia, 1790).

Since portraits also are this same kind of living history, this check list noting the artists, subjects, and whereabouts of 295 portraits owned in Delaware is a logical continuation of the preservation activities of the National Society of Colonial Dames of America. Sponsored by the Delaware Chapter, this is the third of a group of publications covering the beginnings of the First State's history and art. The first is *A Calendar of Delaware Wills, New Castle County, 1680-1800*; and the second is Jessie Harrington's *Silversmiths of Delaware, 1700-1850*, an outstanding contribution on the state's native silversmiths. These publications for the benefit of student, scholar, and layman merit recognition along with the splendid restoration and furnishing activities now being carried out by the national organization at Gunston Hall in Virginia.

Although no portrait painted by a native Delawarean appears in the check list, Mrs. Bates' committee has brought to light some interesting Delaware connections of certain artists, as, for example, Adolph Ulrich Wertmuller, who spent the closing years of his life at Naamen's Creek near Claymont, where he continued his activity as a portrait painter. In detailing the history of George W. Conarroe, of Delaware descent, mention of his work as a cabinetmaker in New Jersey is of considerable interest to antiquarians.

In Delaware as elsewhere in America during the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, the *modus operandi* for "artists of the first

celebrity," as well as those limners of lesser ability, was to make periodic trips from city to city or hamlet to hamlet advertising in the local newspapers. In the *Wilmington American Watchman* in 1823 Francis Martin Drexel advised "that he would be at Lamborn's Hotel for three weeks, and was open for engagements." In 1826 the same artist went as far afield as South America, painting notables on the way, before returning to Philadelphia to open the brokerage house which became the world-famous Drexel and Company.

Occasionally, these traveling artists held exhibitions, as did Robert Street, whose painting of Mrs. Samuel Roland Paynter is among those included in the catalogue. In the 1840's he ran a sensational ad in a Wilmington newspaper stating that he would exhibit at the old Town Hall, ". . . admission twenty-five cents, his wonderful painting of a maniac escaping from a straight jacket."

The group of portraits in this check list attests to the validity of Paul Svinin's observation in his *Picturesque United States of America* published early in the nineteenth century: "Portrait painting is the genre most cultivated in the United States. Americans have a weakness for bequeathing their likeness to posterity. Portrait painters are constantly in demand and well paid."

Although modest in size, this book is typographically excellent, adequately illustrated with thirty-five halftones, and not to be considered a slight work in any sense. It represents a milestone in its painstaking ferreting out and scholarly listing of the portraits of Delaware. From this fine beginning by Mrs. Bates and her committee, it is to be hoped that the search will go on until every portrait in the state can be included in a future check list.

Henry Francis du Pont
Winterthur Museum

CHARLES F. MONTGOMERY

Pittsburgh's Commercial Development, 1800-1850. By CATHERINE ELIZABETH REISER. (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1951. viii, 247 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$2.50.)

In this doctoral dissertation, Miss Reiser has set herself the task of tracing Pittsburgh's economic development in the half century before the coming of the railroad, "to show the influence of the growth of manufacturing and of the improvement of the channels of trade on Pittsburgh's commerce." Almost half of the study is devoted to a description of trade routes, those connecting Pittsburgh's own market area and those linking Pittsburgh with outside markets. Here Miss Reiser discusses in turn the principal "Avenues of Trade," the Ohio River, the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, the eastern turnpikes, the Pennsylvania State System, and subsidiary trade routes. The building of roads and canals is chronicled in some detail. While

tolls are discussed, transportation costs and freight rates are mentioned in only an offhand manner; there is no systematic analysis of these. Perhaps the most valuable contribution is the analysis of the volume and types of goods and commodities shipped to and from Pittsburgh by each trade route. Statistics for trade via the Monongahela Slackwater (1845-1850) and the State System (1835-1850) are placed in convenient tables in the appendix.

The organization of trade from the point of view of merchandising and finance receives less extensive treatment. Some idea of the structure of the business community is given from listings in directories and information in newspapers, although the author errs in assuming that all "companies" were (or are) corporations. The use of business records, as well as such works as Jones' *Middlemen in the Domestic Trade of the United States, 1800-1860* and Atherton's *Pioneer Merchant in Mid-America*, would have strengthened these sections considerably. Miss Reiser traces the growth of Pittsburgh banks, if not banking. Little attention is directed to the relationship between economic expansion and credit extension. Amasa Walker in 1857 characterized bank founders of this period as those who wished to borrow rather than those who had money to lend. How true was this of Pittsburgh bank founders? A chapter on "Attempts at Economic Organization" discusses the collective efforts of the business community in such matters as insurance.

All in all, the Pittsburgh entrepreneur remains a shadowy figure in the background of the story. Where did the Pittsburgh businessman come from? How did he get started in business? How did he operate his business? What were his profits? These are some of the questions that involve the human factors in economic development. Little attention is given to movements of the business cycle, except in reference to the catastrophic effects of major panics.

Viewing the study as a whole, one is impressed by its too exclusive "local history" focus. At the same time, it never seems to reach into the dynamics of the Pittsburgh community. Local studies are essential to a real understanding of American history, but some effort should be made to relate these to national trends and to developments in other areas. Berry's study of the Cincinnati market, for example, provides considerable data for a comparison of Pittsburgh's growth with that of Cincinnati; in point of population, Cincinnati's growth was more spectacular than that of Pittsburgh during this period.

Perhaps many of the faults of the study can be traced to the remarkably thin bibliography. What is striking is not so much the lack of works on such subjects as marketing, credit, and location theory, as the omission of many of the standard books in economic history.

However, while failing to live up to the title which implies a consideration of all the factors entering into commercial development, Miss Reiser has compiled much useful information and statistical material on the movement

of Pittsburgh's trade and its changing directions in the first half of the nineteenth century.

University of Pennsylvania

JAMES H. SOLTOW

Henry C. Carey and American Sectional Conflict. By GEORGE WINSTON SMITH. [University of New Mexico Publications in History, No. 3.] (Albuquerque, N. M.: University of New Mexico Press, 1951. 127 p. Notes, index. \$1.50.)

Mathew Carey and Henry C. Carey, father and son, were particularly noted figures in America in the years between the War of 1812 and the Civil War. Strangely enough, however, history has taken little note of their influence on the thinking of the period in which they lived. Henry C. Carey was born in Philadelphia in 1793, when the city was still the leading metropolitan center of the nation and the people were groping uncertainly for stability in government. He grew up in an era of transition that, before it had ended, had seen Philadelphia lose its dominance to New York and the nationalism that had been struggling upward turn to bitter sectionalism.

Young Carey, though possessing no formal education, took a lively interest in his father's publishing business. Like him, he became greatly concerned with the economic problems of the country. In his search for a unifying force that would bind the divergent sections together in progress and prosperity, he turned after many deviations to protection. George Winston Smith in *Henry C. Carey and American Sectional Conflict* has presented a brief story of Carey's intellectual progress through the maze of opposing interests that disturbed the people in the three decades preceding the Civil War. Unfortunately the study, number three in the University of New Mexico Publications in History, is too limited to permit of more than a general statement of the basic facts involved. Carey, facile and sometimes superficial, was peculiarly subject to influence by all the opposing winds that blew about him. That he eventually achieved enough synthesis out of the antitheses of slavery, abolition, internal improvements, western migration, monopoly, sectional interests, agrarianism, urbanism, poverty, prosperity, pessimism, and optimism, and a host of other factors involving many seeming contradictions, to be recognized by some of his contemporaries as one of the "greatest philosophers of his time" is testimony to his power as an original thinker. But one hundred and twenty pages, however well done, is not an adequate canvas on which to depict in a careful and critical manner the array of conflicting forces that Carey met and the important principles that he developed. Perhaps Mr. Smith will ultimately produce a full-dress biography that will present in rounded fullness one of the outstanding economic thinkers of the ante-bellum period of our history. For the present his study, because it contains some extracts from Carey's writings, is the most useful of the few sketches available.

Temple University

JAMES A. BARNES

A Century of Philadelphia Cricket. Edited by JOHN A. LESTER. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951. xviii, 398 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$10.00.)

Readers of J. A. Lester's book will review cricket in Philadelphia from its infancy to maturity, and then through the "Ice Age" that saw cricket decline to a point where first-class cricket in Philadelphia is but a memory to those who knew it at its best. The older generation who followed cricket will be pleasantly taken back to the days when Saturday afternoons were given over either to playing a match or to watching one from a vantage point in the grandstand or from the porch of the clubhouse. Although the younger generation will not feel the same reaction as the older, they should, however, be highly entertained in reading the accounts of this noble game, once so popular in Philadelphia.

It is surprising to note that cricket did not appear in Philadelphia until nearly one hundred years after its first appearance in America around 1737. The descriptions of the obstacles encountered in successfully bringing it to a point where public interest was keen enough to attract fifteen thousand persons to a one-day match between Philadelphia and Australia, played at Nicetown in 1878 and again in 1891, and to draw twenty-two thousand people to a three-day match played at Manheim between Philadelphia and Lord Hawk's eleven, are most impressive.

During the "English Tour of 1903" fifteen first-class matches were played against various English county elevens. Of these, the Gloucester and Surrey matches are the only ones for which we have complete analyses. It would have been of interest had an analysis appeared for each game played on this tour, as well as for such other important matches as the Halifax and the International, mentioned in the book.

It is interesting to note, on the graph on page 207, how the game which had become so popular in the short period of thirty years, lost out in approximately the same period and declined to today's present level of popularity. Mr. Lester rightfully points out that the turning point in Philadelphia cricket occurred during the years 1909 to 1918. During this time interest in the game slipped fast, not only from the point of view of the spectator, but, worse yet, from the point of view of the players themselves.

Various reasons have been advanced to explain this decline. Mr. Lester states that the usual answer to it is that the American temperament is not suited to cricket. Personally, I cannot agree with this argument any more than I can agree that the American temperament underwent any great change from the peak of Philadelphia cricket to the period Mr. Lester refers to as the "Ice Age." No one, however, is better qualified to account for the decline than W. W. Comfort, whose opinion is expressed on pages 274 and 275.

With Mr. Lester's opinion that first-class cricket is again being played by a Philadelphia eleven, I must beg to differ. It is true that there are a few cricket elevens in existence in Philadelphia, but never will the city be able

to assemble an eleven comparable to those from our first Gentlemen of Philadelphia eleven in 1880 to the last representative eleven in 1908.

It would be difficult to add more about J. B. King's cricket ability than Mr. Lester has already said. To cricketers the world over there was no better-known player than King. Aside from his cricket ability, he was most entertaining, and the saying "never a dull moment" must have been first said by one who was fortunate enough to have been selected for a cricket tour which included him.

As one of America's foremost cricket players and as an ardent student of the game, there is none better qualified to write its one-hundred-year history in Philadelphia than J. A. Lester.

Chestnut Hill, Pa.

C. J. B. DIXON

Gentlemen, Swords and Pistols. By HARNETT T. KANE. (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1951. xiv, 306 p. Bibliography. \$4.00.)

This book is a series of stories, not a study, of several duels and duelists in the South, the Southwest, and in California in the 1800's. Most of the tales are confined to the South and involve such disparate characters as James Bowie, John Randolph, Andrew Jackson, and Thomas Hart Benton, along with an assortment of other distinguished southerners whose only traits in common were hot tempers and a penchant for resolving social slights on the dueling field. Mr. Kane tells his tales in an informal, if graceless, style which never fails to point up the "action, intrigue, and romance" of his story, to use his publisher's words. Footnotes are absent, but as a testament of his accuracy he has appended a lengthy list of acknowledgments and an eleven-page bibliography.

Accurate and readable as it is, judged on its own basis, not as history but as a collection of innocuous biographical sketches of duelists, *Gentlemen, Swords and Pistols* still remains an irritating book. The root of the trouble is Mr. Kane's method. He has chosen to tell of dueling through profiles of the participants. Naturally, since he concentrates on a single side of a man, his characterizations are shallow and warped. Thus, Benton develops as a man who "drew duels the way a blue serge suit draws lint," a man who played with politics as a hobby while concentrating his talents on the code duello. John Randolph, labeled "the half-mad Virginian" by Mr. Kane, appears as a tempestuous maniac, a sensible deduction but one that should be balanced by Henry Adams' conviction that Randolph was also, in the realm of political theory, "the legitimate and natural precursor of Calhoun." The portrait of James Bowie—one of the best in the book—succeeds because it presents the originator of the Bowie knife for what he was: a backwoods and barroom brawler who thrived on a good fight; a professional mawler, not a dignified duelist out to salve his ego.

Several of the personalities that turn up in Mr. Kane's stories the reader might like to pursue further. Unfortunately, the bibliography will give

little help. An awesome catalogue of books consulted, it is arranged in a long alphabetical list, without reference to individual chapters, without critical comment on a volume's value. An impressive ornament, it is nonetheless an ornament, and gives the reader a yearning for the more sensible and discriminating bibliographical essay.

Philadelphia

DAVID HAWKE

Public and Republic: Political Representation in America. By ALFRED DE GRAZIA. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1951. xix, 262 p. Selected readings, index. \$3.50.)

Democratic self-government depends upon the creation of a mechanism of government in which the people have a concern and confidence. The relation, therefore, between public and republic is vital. This book is a history of that relationship in the United States.

The American pattern of self-government was started long ago in England. There a representative system was developed in which the King, church leaders, great landholders and representatives of the localities met in London to work out the rules for the governance of the realm. These elements which were the "virtual" representatives of all the people gradually changed in organization, composition, and in relative importance until the seventeenth century when the House of Commons for a time dominated the scene and a theory of equalitarianism was formulated. All men were equally entitled to vote and participate in government. This concept did not "take hold" in England until much later, but it fitted American conditions.

Such were the precedents at the disposal of the American colonists when they undertook to create the system of checks and balances set forth in the Constitution, which was designed to divide responsibility in such a manner that it would never be concentrated in any one region, class, group or interest.

The great size and growth of the country, however, emphasized a phase of representation which had not been prominent in England—namely, that government should be by equals, chosen by equals, and responsible at frequent intervals to equals—a system of representation which should be operated by an extraconstitutional mechanism, the party system. Whenever any minority, interest or group of interests, social group, or region seems to have undue power, mechanisms must then be devised to insure an appeal to the will of the majority. Such is the evolution of the prevailing theory.

The general implication of this book is that our present system of representation is too simple for our complex society. Technology and intricate economic and social relationships have need of a highly specialized, expert politics. More operational skill is needed in a government which is called upon to regulate highly specialized institutions. Our representation system needs to be revised to insure the inclusion of needed skills and "know-how."

This in a sense would be a return to the old English system of including the principal "estates of the realm" in the government. Our estates are economic, racial, and religious, and need to be represented if there is to be the "feeling of contentment" upon which stability is established.

The author has written a thoughtful book which should have wide reading. He realizes that changes in government generally arise because of the operation of social forces which are not beholden to men's planning. However, as a political scientist he wishes that there might be more "careful, studied tailoring." His hope is that there may be "collaboration of associated social scientists under political direction." To all this we can but say "Amen," although we share with him a realization of its difficulty.

University of Pennsylvania

ROY F. NICHOLS

Old New Castle and Modern Delaware. The Tercentenary of the Founding of New Castle by the Dutch. An Exhibition in the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951. vi, 59 p. Illustrations, index. \$1.00.)

This attractive booklet is the thirteenth publication of the Library of Congress in its series of exhibition catalogues marking important state anniversaries. Held between June 1 and October 31, 1951, the Delaware exhibition highlighted the tercentenary of the founding of New Castle by the Dutch. The catalogue lists primarily documents and photographs spanning three hundred years of Delaware's history since the Dutch established the military outpost of Fort Casimir, which in time would become known as New Castle. In addition to the descriptive catalogue entries, many of them illustrated, this booklet includes the address of John A. Munroe of the University of Delaware, which opened the exhibition. Dr. Munroe's address recounts briefly and interestingly the varied history and development of New Castle, an old town which "offers a sense of the dignity of the past and of enduring values, an understanding of man's achievements and his failures."

The Ephrata Martyrs' Mirror. By DANIEL R. HEATWOLE. (Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1951. 22 p. \$.25.)

This small pamphlet, reprinted from the *Mennonite Community*, tells the very interesting story of the Ephrata printing of the van Bragt *Martyrs' Mirror* of 1660. Translated from Dutch into German and printed at the Cloisters in 1748, the *Martyrs' Mirror* stood beside Saur's German Bible in most Mennonite homes. Mr. Heatwole has told the story of the martyrs' book down to the Revolution and has illustrated it with numerous pictures of the Cloisters and the equipment used for the publication of the *Martyrs' Mirror*.