
In my youth when I first aspired to be a historian, Dr. Jameson’s was a name to conjure with. Fifty years ago he was recognized as the Nestor of the profession. My first actual contact with him was just about that long ago, at Branford where he was wont to assemble historians for a few days in the summer, for what he called a convivium historicum. I forget the name of the hotel which served as headquarters, though I remember that it had old-fashioned bowls and pitchers in the bedrooms, was incredibly cheap, and commanded a fine view of Long Island Sound. You might swim if you wished, though few as I remember did; or you might play croquet. But a large part of the time was spent in rocking chairs on the piazza, generally gathered about an austere-looking gentleman who wore a close-cropped pointed beard, who sat very erect and discoursed, ex cathedra and in very precise English, about the multitudinous problems of the historian. I do not recall that anyone in that company ever addressed him except as Dr. Jameson. Indeed, all his personal relationships, at least in the profession, were touched with a note of formality. Even his disciples, and they were many, thought and spoke of him in reverential terms. As I look over this volume of his correspondence I find that he almost never addressed his closest friends by their Christian names. But that, of course, was in the mid-Victorian tradition. Indeed, one would be disposed to classify him as a mid-Victorian, one of the cultivated liberals who like to write letters to the Times signed “Pro bono publico,” or “Amicus curiae.” But as a historian he was definitely of the German rather than the English tradition. He belongs with Ranke rather than with Macaulay.

It would, of course, be unwise to judge him from that part of his surviving correspondence which is here published. The editors have deliberately selected those letters which reveal him as a historian rather than as a man. Perhaps if they had seen fit to print his diary or his notebooks it would have been more revealing. We should like to have heard more about his flute playing, and his private boxing matches with his friends. He was evidently of tough fiber physically, otherwise he could hardly have survived his desperate adventure in a snowstorm at night in Wales (p. 156). But there are limits to what even lenient publishers like the American Philosophical
Society will finance. As it is, the volume is heavy, ungainly, printed in double columns and about as unalluring to the casual reader as it well could be—which is a pity, because the editors have done a fine job and have produced a record which every intending American historian will do well to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest.

Dr. Jameson’s career at the start was typical of the struggling American scholar, determined by his consuming interest in his subject, but harassed by poverty, which compelled him to undertake many uncongenial tasks to keep body and soul together and provide for his aging parents. It was for that reason that he could not do what he intended to do—finish his training at a German university. In the long view the lack of it was negligible, and he himself came to believe that France was a better place for advanced training than Germany. He did all the things which divert the energies and distract the attention of poor young historians—lecturing, popular writing, and the like. He never wrote a textbook, though he acknowledged that textbooks should be written by good scholars. In a letter to one of his students just beginning his professional career he wrote:

I do not feel any doubt that it would be better not to undertake to write a text book of the sort which is suggested to you or indeed of any sort. . . . Nobody ought to write a text book at your age. Nearly all one’s earlier published work should be research work. Text books should come about the last thing in a man’s career, and if thereby they get crowded out, it is no great harm. . . . It must needs be that text books come, but woe to that man by whom the text book cometh.

Dr. Jameson began as a professional teacher, first at Johns Hopkins, where he took the first Ph.D. granted by that institution, then at Brown for thirteen years (1888–1901), and finally at Chicago (1901–1905). He was not too happy at Brown and rather acutely unhappy at Chicago. He brought to his teaching the same conscientiousness, the same high-mindedness which characterized everything he did. And he was devoted to his abler students. But he got little satisfaction out of teaching in the mass. When the opportunity came in 1905 to exchange with Professor McLaughlin a college professorship at Chicago for the position of Director of the Bureau of Historical Research, recently established at Washington by the Carnegie Institute, he seized it. For the next twenty years, as long, indeed, as the Bureau lasted, he occupied that position. During the remaining nine years of his life he was head of the manuscript department of the Library of Congress.

At the Bureau he found his true métier, that of organizer and director of historical research. In his youth he had dreamed of being a historian in what he considered the true sense of the term—pursuing his own researches and putting them forth (cf. pp. 221–222) in an attractive and effective style. His letter to Homer C. Hockett on the subject is illuminating. “Now,” he wrote, “that you have so well won your spurs as a monograph writer . . .
I would aim hereafter somewhat more at the position of a historian by paying more attention to skill and felicity in writing. . . . If one wishes to take high rank as a historian he had better give himself a good long course in close and attentive reading of histories that have high qualities of style, till he develops that sense of form which is so greatly lacking among our writers of monographs.” He denied that he himself was a historian, and described his position in the profession as that of a “powder monkey, passing forward ammunition for others to fire off” (p. 302).

But he need not have been. Willem Usselinx, his most considerable contribution to the literature of American history, reveals all the attributes which he himself demanded of a historian. Charles Beard, who was certainly no sycophant and who in his prime was one of our most trenchant critics of academic sham and make-believe, wrote to Jameson with reference to the little volume of lectures on the American Revolution which he published in 1926: “I wish that some wise rich man or wise college president (if such there be) had, in 1895, when you first drafted these lectures, freed your powers . . . and permitted you to devote all your talents to the theme of your book. If that had been done we should now have at least one great historical work in America lifted above was uns alle bündigt, das Gemeine” (p. 320 n.).

But it was not economic pressure which led Jameson to exchange a college professorship for a directorate of research. He might have been a Charles Haskins, as on one occasion he sighed to be; he elected instead to be a Jameson. And undoubtedly, historical scholarship in America is the richer for his choice. It was he who, as editor of the American Historical Review, defined and established the high standards of careful, exact scholarship which has characterized the work of those who have followed him. It was he who conceived the idea and later found the funds for the Dictionary of American Biography. It was he, more than any one else, who led American historians out of their isolation and taught them how to enrich the history of their country from the archives of Europe. It was he who worked hard to apply critical scholarship to the historical publications of the United States Government; he who notably increased the historical collections of that great treasury of American history, the Library of Congress; he who above all other men brought order out of chaos in the National Archives and provided them with a repository worthy of them. Probably no one in the profession could have done this kind of work so well, none who combined the high standards of scholarship with the energy, the tact, the indefatigable patience which brought all these good things to pass. This was what he called being a “powder monkey.” For this he sacrificed academic prestige and the more spectacular achievements of historical scholarship.

The great cathedrals survive; the architects who designed them are forgotten. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to Elizabeth Donnan and to Leo Stock, both of whom died before their work appeared and both of whom
spent their last days in failing health upon it, for erecting this noble monument to their master and friend, the chief architect of American historical scholarship, John Franklin Jameson.

Villanova


Two generations of American historians and political scientists have taken Charles A. Beard’s An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution for granted as one of the seminal studies in constitutional history. True, as the debunking thirties drifted into the past, there developed a body of scepticism about Beard’s general historiographical position, specifically about his Mannheim-like assumption that history is a weapon to be utilized in the fulfillment of the historian’s social goals. But until Professor Brown of Michigan State University entered the lists, none but spluttering iconodules had ever seriously questioned the historical integrity of An Economic Interpretation. . . .

I must confess that I began Brown’s little book with a strong sense of doubt, for the academic woods these days are full of young men shooting elephants, and the tedious semantic squabbling that resulted from W. W. Crosskey’s constitutional version of Worlds in Collision left me with a profound suspicion of “fundamental reappraisals.” I finished the book with a sense of shame, for it seems clear to me that Brown has made the bulk of constitutional scholars—myself included—appear as uncritical as children in their approach to Beard.

In essence, Brown has demonstrated that Beard’s evidence was simply inadequate as documentation for his hypothesis. Moreover, unless one is willing to admit that Beard did not know what evidence looked like—an untenable assumption on its face—he is forced to the conclusion that the master engaged in thoroughly disingenuous historical behavior by distorting and contorting his data. Every scholar has on occasion, I suspect, found himself revising a fact or two to support a sound theory and caught himself up, but Brown’s painstaking study of Beard’s footnote documentation leads this reviewer at least to the regretful conclusion that the slips were too consistently favorable to his thesis to be explicable in terms of unconscious bias. It is easy to defame the dead, yet an alternative explanation is not apparent, and Brown’s surgical approach is coldly devastating.

The twin foundations upon which Beard erected his constitutional edifice were: (1) the fundamentally undemocratic character of American politics in 1789; and (2) the basic economic struggle in the states between agricultural interests and personalty. In nuce, Beard alleged that the control over
politics by the personality elite—the commercial and banking interests of the big cities—was the undemocratic leverage behind the establishment of the Republic, and that the Constitution represented a triumph of these creditors over the debtor class, the disfranchised, unrepresented agrarian masses.

Brown’s microscopic scrutiny of Beard’s evidence leads him to state not that Beard was unquestionably wrong, but that his evidence did not demonstrate what it was alleged to demonstrate. First, he declares, Beard did not prove in any legitimate scholarly fashion that American politics were in fact controlled by the seaboard elite. On the contrary, Brown suggests, Beard’s own evidence could lead to the opposite conclusion, namely, that in a highly homogeneous society of small farmers, a nation 95% rural in 1790, these small farmers constituted the dominant political power—whenever they chose to exercise it. Second, Brown maintains, Beard’s evidence does not support his hypothesis of an embryonic class struggle between commercial and agrarian interests—a struggle too one-sided on its face to be undertaken by any sane banker in 1790. Indebtedness was then, as now, widespread, but who were the creditors? Were they city bankers? or neighboring farmers? or artisans in the country towns? For that matter, who were the debtors? farmers only? or bankers and businessmen? In short, Beard gave no substantial evidence for the existence of a rigid creditor class, nor for its localization in the cities. Without this sort of evidence, Brown asserts, the structure of Beard’s analysis is meaningless and his categories illusory.

Since a review is not an abridgment, we must pass over Brown’s re-examination of the property holdings of the Framers and Beard’s use of this data, as well as his brilliant reappraisal of the process of ratification. What does deserve brief mention, however, is Brown’s substitute for Beard’s thesis, for this will supply the subject matter of scholarly argument for some time to come.

Brown postulates that in 1789, the United States were a democratic, middle-class society with widely diffused property ownership and much more public participation in the political process than has generally been supposed. Thus the Constitutional Convention was not a conclave of an undemocratic elite, but a gathering of responsible representatives of the people who were selected in the same manner as representatives to Congress, i.e., by the state legislatures—except in Rhode Island, where annual popular elections were held—and who had to keep in mind throughout the Convention the limits put upon their discretion by public opinion back home. Since virtually all Americans were property holders, it was not surprising that the Framers spent a good deal of time worrying about the protection of property rights: this was what their constituents, farmers and bankers alike, had on their minds. In short, “The Constitution was created about as much by the whole people as any government could be which embraced a large area and depended on representation rather than on direct participation” (p. 199). It follows from this that the Convention can be better understood as a smoke-
filled room where politicians labored for their constituents than as a sinister cabal of self-serving mercantile agents.

I am impressed by Brown's interpretation, and the evidence he has presented on the democratic character of early American politics, while scanty in scope, is striking. However, before this view can be given full support, much more evidence must be dug up on the point—which is the keystone of Brown's arch, particularly on the political character of the states south of Mason and Dixon's line. I understand Professor Brown is now engaged in this tremendous task and I look forward to his conclusions; if he is right, much traditional thinking about the Federal period will have to be scrapped.
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Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780. By ROBERT E. BROWN. (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955. xii, 460 p. Bibliographical note, index. $6.00.)

History has a way of responding to cycles of opinion and interest. Interpretations of great events change from time to time and curves of opinion have a tendency to become almost circular. The American Revolution is no exception to the implications of this statement. When the stirring events of 1763-1781 were first recorded, they were described as the creations of a free and liberty-loving people who, galled by the yoke of British tyranny, left their ways of peace and took up arms to throw off the burden.

In the years that followed, particularly after the restudy stimulated by the interest in the scientific history of the seminar, more careful study produced new interpretations. The colonials were shown to be hampered in their voting by property and religious qualifications. Few of them seemed to participate. Local government was in the hands of mercantile and clerical oligarchies concentrated in the older towns on the seacoast. Back-country counties were underrepresented and the frontier settlements neglected. When the struggle against the mother country finally developed, it was led by merchants who were motivated by the threat of taxation to their interests. But having once roused the yeomen, the latter engineered a social revolution which gave them their first step upward toward democracy. Finally, Britain, after all, was only asking for a fair return for her effort and expense of protection. The implication in more recent times seems to have been that the colonists were on the whole ungrateful and had they been a little more patient, the whole difficulty could have been worked out without bloodshed and separation.

Now the wheel has turned again, and in this latest careful and scholarly monograph we are back to the embattled farmers fighting a tyrannical
government to protect their liberties. A careful analysis of the records of the Massachusetts towns, the tax lists, the probate dockets and the like has shown that the property qualification was so low that it could have deprived but few of the franchise. Those who did not vote did so, presumably, largely because they were not interested. The Massachusetts communities were self-governing, middle-class democracies. If any group was overrepresented and unduly favored in the legislature, it was the agricultural back country rather than Boston and the mercantile towns. The local Massachusetts leaders for years had been resisting British efforts to curtail their freedom, and they needed no tax-nervous merchants to awaken them to action in 1764–1765. The embattled farmers were fighting to preserve their long-cherished liberties, not to enforce a social revolution.

This volume, which was published by the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund for the American Historical Association, is an excellent piece of scholarship which raises some interesting questions. Was democracy further along in its development in the colonies than generally supposed? Was there not real democracy in some parts of the Union, at least, long before Andrew Jackson's day? More studies of this character should be undertaken for several, at least, of the other colonies to see whether conditions were uniformly more democratic than supposed.
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Nicolaus Ludwig, Count von Zinzendorf, actually spent only thirteen months of his brilliantly active life in Pennsylvania. Yet he fostered new zeal in the religious life of the entire German element of the colony, fathered the establishment of a major colonial outpost which was to grow into a leading urban center, and supplied the driving force behind the most successful Indian missions in British America. In Europe the Count and his protégés of the renewed Unitas Fratrum, or Moravian Church, strongly influenced the evangelical revival, the renewal of Western hymnology, and the Protestant foreign missions movement.

By his birth in 1700, of a union of two distinguished noble German houses, Nicolaus Ludwig fell heir to a goodly heritage. Determinants of his extraordinary career were the eminent social position, solid cultural foundation, and distinguished connections of his family, the comfortable prosperity and sober tradition of social responsibility of his class, and the fervent piety and devoted humanitarianism of his age and country.

Reared by his grandmother and schooled at Halle, Zinzendorf early curtailed his courtly duties to devote more time to developing havens for
religious enthusiasts on his estate at Berthelsdorf. After the arrival there of Hussite refugees from the Austrian dominions, it becomes increasingly difficult to separate the Zinzendorfian from the Moravian elements in the dual history of the Count and the Unitas. Beginning with the Diaspora, an evangelistic program carried forward within the state churches, Zinzendorf moved rapidly also into pioneering work in the Protestant foreign mission field. With his ordination as a Lutheran clergyman and his consecration as a Moravian bishop he began such a mingling of the orthodox with the unconventional as could hardly escape criticism. His ultimate success in both pacifying the European authorities and expanding his program—despite his arrogance and fondness for innovation—is a tribute both to his own skill and to the toleration of his contemporaries.

Although Zinzendorf was interested in British America both as a refuge from possible oppression and as a base for missionary operations among the heathen of the New World, the author attributes his sojourn in Pennsylvania primarily to the hope that he could here fulfill his dream of federating all Christian denominations into a higher “Congregation of God in the Spirit.” Associating himself with others of similar aspirations, he soon became the leader of the striking movement for Christian federation known as the “Pennsylvania Synods,” which included both British and German participants. Although the movement failed, it stimulated religious fervor generally, provoked the several denominations to strengthen their own organizations as countermeasures to his ecumenical tendencies, and hastened the emergence of Moravianism as a separate denomination. At the same time, Zinzendorf performed appreciable—albeit controversial—missionary work among the Germans, advanced the cause of education among them, and perfected the organization of Bethlehem as a communal center for missionary enterprise. His quixotic excursions among the Indians proved him more able as a planner than as a doer in this field.

The story of the Count is a significant and romantic one, illuminating our own religious history and linking it with important developments in Europe. The author has told it ably, charting an easily followed line of march through a far-flung mass of complex events, and moving among them with both sympathy and detachment. Perhaps too little emerges of Zinzendorf the man. Although this is largely dictated by the extent to which his life was interwoven with the history of the Unitas and by the welcome conciseness of the book itself, it is disappointing that his personality has not been more clearly developed and more intimately explored. Despite an apparent familiarity with basic sources, the author has confined his citations to obvious works, not often buttressing his judgments or indicating the bases for new interpretations. As an introduction to both Zinzendorf and his work this volume is without peer. Delightful line drawings enhance its engaging story.

Philadelphia
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James Wilson, Founding Father, 1742-1798. By Charles Page Smith.
(Chapel Hill, N. C.: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1956. xiv, 426 p. Frontispiece, index. $7.50.)

In the course of his fifty-six years, James Wilson, the son of a poor Scottish farmer, achieved one of the highest positions in American public life. In 1798 he fell with a dramatic crash. Although he was an associate justice of the United States Supreme Court, he was a refugee from his creditors and from debtors prison, and died a broken man in a poor North Carolina inn. He had come to America in 1765 after an education at St. Andrews University. He studied law with John Dickinson and then practiced with ever-growing success, first at Reading, then at Carlisle, and after 1778, in Philadelphia.

In 1774 he was elected to the first provincial convention in Pennsylvania and from then on until his death, he was a leading figure in both Pennsylvania and national politics. He opposed independence, but voted for it at the last moment. He supported Dickinson's plan for a stronger central government than that provided by the Articles of Confederation. He was a leading opponent of the "democratic" Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776. Like his political and economic allies in Pennsylvania he was a "nationalist" from the beginning of the Revolution, and he became one of the leading theorists in the effort to create a powerful central government. He was a leading debater in the Convention of 1787, and after 1789, as a justice of the Supreme Court, a strong supporter of national power against the powers of the states.

Through it all he practiced law and sought to increase his fortune, mainly by speculation in land. Perhaps no speculator since then has ever tried to achieve so much with so little real capital, or engaged in any more dubious stratagems. In the end he came to ruin as did many another man in one or the other of the two financial crashes of the 1790's.

Until now Wilson has never had a biographer. Perhaps, as Charles Page Smith suggests, it was because he was an "uncongenial subject for the filiopietistic pens of nineteenth-century biographers who demanded of any American hero a spotless escutcheon, or one whose blemishes could be readily obscured with a little patriotic gilt" (p. 391). Smith neither points the finger of scorn nor attempts to apply gilt, although he does give Wilson the benefit of most doubts. Instead, he tries to understand Wilson and assess his role in history. He offers much that is new and significant, derived in part from his study of Wilson as a lawyer, and partly from his analysis of Wilson's political and legal theories.

There is a valuable account of treason trials in Pennsylvania during the war in which Wilson was lawyer for the defense, and it is suggested that Wilson was probably responsible for the definition of treason in the Constitution of 1787. The section on Wilson's law lectures is not only a lucid
exposition of their content (no easy matter considering Wilson's prose style),
but it contains many thoughtful suggestions on the "revolution in law" and
its relation to the American Revolution. The portions on Wilson and the
Supreme Court have much that is new, and John Marshall's "nationalism"
is put in proper perspective: his ideas were enunciated by the court in the
1790's, and particularly by Wilson.

In these and other places, the biography is invaluable for insights, sug-
gestions, and new materials. It is possible to differ with the accounts of
Wilson the politician, the land speculator, and above all, as a key figure in
the Convention of 1787. This is said in no quibbling sense, but because
serious problems of interpretation are involved.

Was, for instance, the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776 "unworkable,"
or was it made so by the bitter opposition of Wilson and his fellow "Re-
publicans" who in effect went on strike against the government so blindly
that for years the government of the state was virtually unable to
function? Wilson's land speculations almost echo through the book, yet
nowhere is there a really clear picture of his methods and his holdings.
Wilson was president of the Illinois-Wabash Company at a time when it
and other companies had great political influence in Congress; and some of
these companies' petitions contain constitutional theories strikingly like
those Wilson used both then and later. Perhaps there is not enough material
for a thorough study, but I feel that this part of Wilson's life is slighted.

The most fascinating part of the book to me is Smith's interpretation of
Wilson's political philosophy. At the beginning of the book are two quota-
tions. One by Professor Hockett declares that Wilson "ranks with James
Otis and Thomas Jefferson as one of the great democrats of the formative
period of the Republic." The other, written by this reviewer, says that
Wilson, among others, was "always conservative in political philosophy and
practice." Smith accepts Hockett's statement rather than mine, and after
reading his account, I am ready to amend mine—up to a point. The diffi-
culty with the picture of Wilson as a democrat is his career in Pennsylva-
nia politics. There, as Smith says, "he had fought an unceasing war, almost
since his entrance into political life, against the radical democratic elements
of the Pennsylvania frontier" (p. 243). Yet Wilson did use "democratic
arguments" in the Convention of 1787 in urging the popular election of both
houses of Congress. In the effort to reconcile political theory and political
practice there seems to be some confusion. In one place Smith says that the
"basic division" in the Convention was between "those who wished to have
the constitution emerge as an essentially aristocratic document and those
who championed the principle of democracy" (p. 222). Here he leans close
to the position of a recent article called "Men of Little Faith: The Anti-
Federalists on the Nature of Representative Government." But Smith is
too good a historian to follow such a misreading of the evidence very far,
as he makes clear a few pages later when he says "the split was not funda-
mentally between conservative and liberal; it was rather between those who
considered themselves guardians of the states . . . and those who insisted that the states must surrender a major part of their sovereignty if an effective national government was to be constructed" (p. 230).

Was Wilson really a democrat? I think not, and I would like to suggest a tentative answer. In 1787 the practical political problem of those who wanted a strong central government was to create one freed from state control, one which in turn could exercise control over state governments dominated by unchecked legislative majorities. In addition, since the Convention decided to ignore the call of Congress for a revision of the Articles of Confederation, some members of the Convention raised the question of the legality of its proceedings.

Wilson was more concerned than most members with providing a theoretical foundation for the work of the Convention, and it was sheer political genius on his part to seize upon the revolutionary doctrine of the "sovereignty of the people" to provide that foundation. If the people were sovereign, the states were not; the sovereign people could delegate power to either the state or central governments in any amount they chose. Thus Wilson provided a theory to by-pass the effective power of the states and to justify the work of the Convention. Less subtle nationalists in the Convention, fearful of democracy in either theory or practice, missed the point; but the two most brilliant members of the Convention, Alexander Hamilton and Gouverneur Morris, did not. Furthermore, Wilson placed the states-rights men in a logical dilemma from which there was no escape.

Mr. Smith may not agree with this interpretation of Wilson's "democracy," but it seems to me that it avoids some of the difficulties involved in trying to square Wilson's political theory with his political practice. Meanwhile, it should be clear that Smith's biography opens up many new approaches to the history of the period and that it should stimulate further interest in a "founding father" all too long ignored.
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Cities in Revolt will certainly be regarded as a monument of American social history. In the brief compass of 440 pages, Carl Bridenbaugh, Professor of American history at the University of California, extends his survey of five British colonial cities from 1743 to 1776. The task, a formidable one, is not likely to be redone, and few future researchers will not be thankful for his summary of a vast range of manuscript and printed sources.

What results from his investigation is virtually an encyclopedic account of Boston, Newport, New York, Philadelphia and Charleston over a little
more than a generation. From newspapers, diaries, and public records, Professor Bridenbaugh has drawn contemporary insight into science, politics, class structure, civic life and a host of other categories. His careful attention to each urban area in turn avoids hasty generalization, but demonstrates throughout the period the steady influence of the Enlightenment and the gradual extension of eighteenth-century rationalism into every corner of life. The climax of this process becomes inevitably (by the choice of period) the establishment of American nationalism and independence with its concomitant alteration of established patterns of colonial life. For this traditional theme Professor Bridenbaugh finds new and novel evidence in the gradual realignment of classes and above all in the economic uncertainties of a merchant class forced to contend at once with the prices and competition of peace and British administrative reform; a combination which in fact largely dissolved the tradition of control and leadership which the merchants had for so long exercised.

*Cities in Revolt* makes no plea for the exclusive role of the city in the remaking of American character. Instead the author views: "The primary role of the cities . . . was preparatory. They provided five centers where the essential conjunction of people, leadership and events could occur and give expression to what Thomas Jefferson with his customary felicity called 'the unquestionable republicanism of the American Mind.'"

Accustomed as moderns are to the influence of the city, few will quarrel with this thesis. Whether most readers will agree that the peculiar problems of urban growth in the eighteenth-century weighed more heavily with patriots than the values they shared with frontier and rural colonists is more problematic. Professor Bridenbaugh refuses the gauntlet and stresses that his is an account not of the causes of the Revolution but of its urban setting. This he accomplishes to perfection.

The rapid growth of these five American cities in the mid-eighteenth century laid the demographic and material foundation for the extension of new ideas and the application of rational investigation. Housing, streets, health, commerce, communication all called for a direct rational solution and experience so gained later became applied to more controversial issues. In noting American urban advance in these decades Professor Bridenbaugh uses as his standard the British city of second rank. In many regards he finds the colonial city the equal or superior of the provincial British city. In population, health, sanitation, even building, he measures Philadelphia and to a less extent its sister cities against Bristol, Liverpool, and Manchester (more rarely does he include Dublin and Edinburgh). Unfortunately, he does not choose to probe the relative impact of urban growth upon political thought and social leadership in the English city. This reviewer would hope that before Professor Bridenbaugh abandons the field of early American urban history he would find the time to compare in even greater detail the provincial English city to its American counterpart. The question is complex, but in its answer may lie many clues to difference between Englishman
and colonial. No other American of our time has so well demonstrated his competence to unravel the intricacies of the problem.
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Elias Hicks, Quaker Liberal. By BLISS FORBUSH. With a Foreword by FREDERICK B. TOLLES. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956. xxiii, 355 p. Illustrations, appendix, index. $5.50.)

Paradoxically enough, the year 1956, which has witnessed the final union of the two Philadelphia Yearly Meetings of Friends after one hundred thirty-three years of the great schism in American Quakerism known as "Hicksite," also sees the publication of the first full-length biography of the man from whom the Separation of 1827–1828 derived its popular name. Whether or not the denomination was a just one, Elias Hicks seems inevitably to have generated either respect and love or criticism and opposition in his own lifetime; his memory and some of his ideas still retain power to arouse enthusiasm or, in some quarters, suspicion.

Hicks represented the Quaker quietism of the late eighteenth century, and his persistence and success in upholding the religious ideas of his youth and early maturity made him a peculiar target for the evangelical revivalists of the following generation. He was born in western Long Island in 1748, lived and farmed there for more than fourscore years, and died there in 1830. But in the course of his lifetime he witnessed two wars and a revolution, the abolition of Negro slavery within the Society of Friends and in states north of the Mason-Dixon line, the rise and decline of the deism and rationalism of the revolutionary period, and the coming of the evangelical revival.

As this full and competent biography of one of the greatest Quaker preachers in the great age of the Quaker traveling ministry shows, the consuming interest of Elias Hicks lay in the Society of Friends. He saw Quakerism as a "spiritual remnant," hedged about by many safeguards against the world, a position which quietist preachers such as Job Scott of Rhode Island had always asserted was the true destiny of Quakerism. So deep was his dedication and so great his power that Elias Hicks had enormous influence among American Friends in the long years of a ministry which began in 1779. He traveled more than 40,000 miles on horseback or by carriage, preaching to Friends and others. Walt Whitman loved to hear him preach, and when he spoke at Trenton in 1824, the governor and legislature offered him the use of the State House for his message! To many he represented in his own person the strenuous resistance to evangelicalism which lay deep in American Quaker thinking, and he personally shepherded the movements in Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore and Ohio Yearly Meetings which led to the Separation of 1827–1828.
In one sense this story of Elias Hicks gains its greatest importance from the fact that it shows so vividly the impact of the evangelical movement on American life and thought: how it arose in England and was brought to this country by fervid pamphlets and persuasive preachers; how it determined to set up new standards of creed and conduct for Anglo-American Protestants; and how it resulted in division after division in the American churches, including the Society of Friends, in the years between the Revolution and the Civil War.

The book is also valuable as it portrays the life and ways of Friends and other Americans in the early days of the Republic—farming, merchandising, traveling on roads and rivers and staying at wretched inns, and promoting philanthropy and reform. It shows how the Friends reacted when wars swirled around them, how they conducted the affairs of their religious Society, and their family lives and friendships. Elias Hicks appears at full length, although with a certain lack of the life and power which his reputation as a preacher imputes to him. But perhaps it is impossible fully to re-create in cold print for another age the spirit and message of a personality who spoke in language and ideas peculiar to his time and whose power lay in his speaking.

One caveat is due the non-Quaker reader. The word “Liberal” appears in the title of the book and throughout the text, sometimes capitalized, sometimes not. Anyone unacquainted with Quakerism might wonder how a man who opposed the wearing of gum shoes, the digging of the Erie Canal, and the construction of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, who even frowned on the planting of flower gardens by his womenfolk, could be called “liberal.” Some of his theology might hardly be considered “liberal” today. Even in the Society of Friends the word is somewhat confusing, for among the Friends who disowned Elias Hicks and his sympathizers, a later schism took place in which the more evangelically-minded group called itself “Progressive.” But the Hicksite Friends, especially those of a more recent generation, have preferred to think of themselves as the “Liberal” wing of the Society. So this study of Elias Hicks by a distinguished leader among Baltimore “Liberal” Friends is, then, an extremely sympathetic one, done in a modern setting; and it should be so understood by those who try to follow the ramifications of American Quaker thought and organization, both now and a century ago.

Haverford College

Thomas E. Drake

*John Filson of Kentucke. By JOHN WALTON. (Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1956. xiv, 130 p. Illustrations, index. $4.00.)*

John Filson, born about 1753 in Chester County, Pennsylvania, disappeared thirty-five years later in southern Ohio. Filson’s name has been
associated with that of Kentucky because his small book, *The Discovery, Settlement and Present State of Kentucke*, published in 1784, stimulated migration into that region and helped make Daniel Boone a legendary figure. Dr. Walton has painstakingly assembled the available facts about Filson, has produced a readable account, but has not quite made his subject into a real human being. This can be attributed to the lack of source material and not to any dereliction of the author. About a man who was "the first historian of Kentucky, the biographer of Boone, and a cartographer of extraordinary ability," who "achieved fame in Europe as well as in America," there is apparently not enough information in existence to construct a full-fledged life story. Despite the remark of J. Winston Coleman, Jr., in the introduction (p. xiii) that this is a full-length biography, "starkly scrupulous in its factual recital," perhaps a shorter, polished monograph on Filson would have been better.

Too much space seems devoted to discussing Ulster, the Scotch-Irish, and various family names. Perhaps this was done to help compensate for the almost complete lack of knowledge of Filson's early life (before 1783). Three chapters (pp. 21–61) tell of Filson's book, and almost half of this space is devoted to an account of Daniel Boone (Chapter V). Chapter VI is a discussion of Filson's map of Kentucky. A copy of this map, inclosed in the end pocket, adds an authentic and valuable accessory to the account. (Incidentally, an obvious fault of Walton's is the lack of a bibliography.)

Unwarranted generalizations or suppositions include the following: "There were no Tories among the Scotch-Irish" (p. 6); "There was not the slightest vein of pacifism anywhere in their culture" (p. 7); "More than any other hero, Boone has become a part of our national folklore" (p. 50); "In 1778 George Rogers Clark had explored the Old Northwest" (p. 80). Certain comments should be documented with supporting evidence, if true: for example, that Filson "acquired a reputation for annoying persistence" (p. 28), and that he was pedantic, didactic, trivial, often irritating and even ludicrous (p. 102).

There are apparent contradictions and repetitions which are somewhat vexing. Did the Presbyterians found Transylvania College (p. 8), or was it a state institution from its origin? (This was mentioned several times, most lengthily on pages 95–96.) Was it John or Robert Breckenridge in partnership with Filson (p. 104)? We are told several times that Filson wrote his book to increase the worth of his landholdings (pp. 27, 34, 64, 74); that it was a "piece of promotional literature" (pp. 28, 64); that Filson's map was composed in large measure from secondhand accounts and that it is remarkable that it is as accurate as it is (pp. 42, 63, 66, 67); and that George Washington refused to endorse Filson's book and map despite two letters to him (pp. 41, 42, 73). Repeatedly appears the information that Filson helped found the city of Cincinnati, which he had named Losantiville. There are no apparent grammatical errors, except the sentence in which the antecedent of "him," "he," and "his" was "Ulstermen" (p. 5). The only irritat-
ing comment on the obvious is that “Photography . . . is lacking” in Filson’s book (p. 64). But why does Walton use such an obscure word as “stramash” (p. 103), when he abhors such pedantry in Filson’s style?

Filson’s brief career on the frontier, of five years’ duration, makes up the nucleus of this work. He was a teacher, but we do not know exactly what he taught, where he taught, or how; he was not quite a typical frontiersman, or surveyor, or map maker, or real-estate promoter. Romance was apparently missing from his life. He was an ambitious, optimistic man of grand, albeit naïve, plans, with never enough money or credit or ability to bring them to fruition. The greatest contributions of this book consist of the sections from Filson’s early work and the fragmentary accounts of his trips back to Pennsylvania and into the Northwest Territory. This is good frontier material. The Boone story also is interesting and more believable than later versions.

State Teachers College, Millersville

Abram J. Foster

The Colonial American in Britain. By William L. Sachse. (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956. x, 290 p. Index. $5.50.)

The list of titles concerned with the Atlantic community has grown rapidly in the past few years and Dr. Sachse’s volume is a welcome addition to their number. He has followed the colonial American in his travels to the homeland, and has recaptured for us the anticipation and delight of the returned pilgrim. The American who made the trip across the Atlantic usually was identified with the middle or upper class—a minister, a southern planter, or a northern merchant. If young, he was likely to be a student sent abroad to study law in London or medicine in Edinburgh, or perhaps attend classes in Oxford or Cambridge. To these eastbound Americans going “home for England” satisfied a deep need to share in a world larger than that of their own provinces.

Colonials went as tourists, as businessmen, as political emissaries. They went on religious errands, or they sought the company and instruction of scientists and artists. Whoever they were, they could not help comparing their way of life in the colonies with that of the homeland. Sometimes they recognized the latter’s superiority, but they were also quick to suggest that changed conditions in the New World required novel approaches. Thus it was argued that the British plan of education was unsuited to American youth because, said a Carolinian, “the Genius of our People, their Way of Life, their Circumstances in Point of Fortune, the Customs and Manners and Humours of the Country, difference us in so many important Respects from Europeans, that a plan of Education, however judiciously adapted to these last, would no more fit us than an Almanac, calculated for the Latitude of London, would that of Williamsburg.” While Americans might
feel that the British plan of education was unsuited to them, they sought Britain’s aid in support of colonial colleges. And the aid was generous—£24,000 was collected in the British Isles for the American schools founded in the eighteenth century.

During two crucial periods, the Interregnum and the decade before the American Revolution, colonials played important parts in the life of the homeland. In the seventeenth century some sixty New Englanders, including thirty-five Harvard men, left to occupy religious posts in the mother country. These departures dismayed colonial authorities who, thus early in our history, counted the cost to American society of the practice of expatriation by our intellectuals. In Cromwell’s England a number of returned New Englanders achieved high rank, including Hugh Peter, Edward Winslow, and the pliable George Downing who managed to serve both Puritan saints and Restoration sinners. During the Commonwealth eight colonials sat in the House of Commons, and about a century later a small group of Americans was again to be found in Parliament. On the eve of the American Revolution the brothers Lee, Arthur and William, of Virginia, were very active in the politics of the city of London, throwing their support to John Wilkes, hero to radicals on both sides of the Atlantic.

Anglophilism was usually strong among the visitors to the Old World, but in the era of the American Revolution colonials viewed politics and society in England more critically, finding fault particularly with her class stratification. But pride in the social progress of their own colonies could not hide an underlying attachment to the “Old Country.” Others before Dr. Sachse have followed the trail of the colonial in Britain, but I can think of no one who has uncovered so many of the visiting Americans or understood better the reasons for their going “home for England.”

City College, N. Y.

Michael Kraus


Every writer of history is tempted to minimize the work that has previously been done on his subject. Miss Loveland yields to this temptation to a surprising degree when she says in her preface: “In most books on church history, the Church of England in the British Colonies in America becomes, as if by magic, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. No detailed account of the tensions and difficulties involved in the process has been published.”

Actually, more has been written about “the critical years” than about any other period in the history of the American Episcopal Church. In a field so well worked, a new book, to justify itself from a scholarly point of
view, must either make a new contribution to the knowledge and understanding of its subject, or present the familiar material with greater thoroughness and more soundness of organization than has previously been achieved.

Miss Loveland hardly meets the first condition, but she admirably fulfills the second. While she gives little that is new, either of fact or interpretation, she has covered the recognized sources with great thoroughness (except that she might have made a little more use of diocesan journals), and she presents the results with notable smoothness and clarity.

It is a matter of mild regret that she should have revived S. D. McConnell's terms "ecclesiastical" and "federal" to describe the two lines of reorganization. That usage begs the question with respect to one of the most interesting issues in the interpretation of the period. Which showed a fuller sense of the true nature of the church: To seek the episcopate, wherever it could be found, before there was any ecclesiastical organization; or to organize the church first and then obtain bishops from the mother church with the most strict precautions to ensure full regularity in the succession?

The questions which were raised concerning the validity of Samuel Seabury's consecration are presented by Miss Loveland with great fairness and precision. As she shows, the issue, insofar as there was any, turned on the contention that irregularity of jurisdiction, which the English ascribed to the Scottish bishops, could invalidate consecration. Most authorities on polity would reject such a contention, but, since the question was raised, it is fortunate that the American episcopate does not depend on Seabury for its validity. He took part in the first American consecration, that of Thomas John Claggett as Bishop of Maryland, but three bishops in the English line (the canonical number) were also present. Through this consecration (the only one in which he participated) Seabury enters the American succession, but not in an essential capacity.

One sentence in her treatment of this topic is open to misconstruction. She says (p. 126), "That the Scottish bishops had maintained the succession from apostolic times was not questioned." Of course, she does not mean this to be taken quite literally, but even without undue literalness it might be understood as at least implying that the Scottish succession had continued unbroken from the medieval church, whereas, in fact, it was a minor branch of the English succession. The Scottish line was broken at the Reformation, renewed from England under James I, broken again during the Commonwealth, and renewed again from England at the Restoration. It was through these Restoration bishops that the Scottish prelates traced their ecclesiastical lineage. This fact had some bearing on their right to perpetuate the succession after they had become separated from the government of the Church of England as it then existed.

Philadelphia Divinity School

William Wilson Manross
Autobiography of Peter Cartwright. With an Introduction, Bibliography, and Index by CHARLES L. WALLIS. (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1956. xxxiv, 349 p. $3.75.)

By his own admission, Peter Cartwright was “one of the Lord’s breaking plows.” He belonged to a generation of hard-riding circuit preachers who proclaimed the spiritual vigor of Methodism throughout the length and breadth of what we now call the Midwest. The revivalism which he used and the muscular Christianity which he preached and lived have for us today an added interest as we happily contemplate the nation’s continuing spiritual and moral growth. The volume at hand is entitled *Autobiography of Peter Cartwright*. The Reverend Charles L. Wallis, Professor of English at Keuka College, Keuka Park, New York, has supplied the book with a brief but helpful introduction, bibliography, and index. Cartwright’s autobiography was first published in 1856.

Peter Cartwright was born in Amherst County, Virginia, September 1, 1785. Shortly thereafter his family moved to Logan County, Kentucky, and settled near the Tennessee border. As might be anticipated, he took part in the religious revivals that then swept the area and experienced conversion. In 1802, about the time of his seventeenth birthday, Peter Cartwright was authorized to form a new circuit of preaching points in the area north and west of his home. His zeal was of such order that he continued similar tasks for the next fifty-three years.

Our subject’s personality and his physical vigor afford the keys to an understanding of his ministry and its manifest success. Through his autobiography runs a thread of winsomeness, amiability, and humor. His generosity was legendary, as was his sincere and completely unsophisticated zeal for things of the spirit. Compromise was rarely to be found in his character. By modern standards of churchmanship he was contentious, undisciplined, and narrowly sectarian. His outbursts against the Mormons, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians were usually verbal, but on a number of occasions they were physical as well. Apparently he only assaulted his victims when they proved unrepentant after the onslaught of his oratory, or when they threatened him with indignities. He was in the unusual ecclesiastical position of hating slavery and despising abolitionism—certainly a feat both intellectual and civil in its implications.

Cartwright also sought and won public office—in 1828 and 1832 he was elected to the lower house of the Illinois General Assembly. In 1832 he defeated Abraham Lincoln. Finally, in 1846, as a Democratic nominee for Congress, he was roundly defeated by the young attorney he had charged with “infidelism.” As a legislator he displayed the usual Methodist concern for social matters pertaining to public and private morality. In addition, he was keenly interested in the development of institutions of higher education. He was responsible to a considerable degree for the founding and development of such well-known institutions as Illinois Wesleyan University,
McKendree College, MacMurray College for Women, and Garrett Biblical Institute. It is important to remember this as we come across statements in which he expresses disapproval of advanced theological education for the ministry.

This reviewer is more than a little tired of ecclesiastical biographies in which the subject seems to do little else than be biologically responsible for the presence of hordes of well-scrubbed and impossibly angelic children. We are mercifully spared such a distorted view of Peter Cartwright. When he died on September 25, 1872, he had fathered nine children, only one of which failed to live until maturity. His beggarly stipend seemed to cover the family's barest needs only because he early settled them on a farm at Pleasant Plains, Illinois. Cartwright's family seems always to take a well-defined second place to his ministerial labors—an attitude usually productive of great benefit to the church.

This book is different, and I think it's worth reading. Perhaps those with a particular interest in Methodist statistics and administrative personalities will disagree, but I believe the general reader will not become unduly excited over the frequent and rather lengthy reports of the happenings at the numerous Methodist Conferences. The volume offers certain interesting psychological and sociological side lights on the revivalistic technique of Cartwright's time. Peter was an interesting personality—perhaps for his time and place he approached greatness.

Philadelphia

J. Milton Bell


The reader of this biography will note at once that it is about David and not Davy Crockett, and he will find this a refreshing antidote to the numbness produced by the immortal lyrics written to the "king of the wild frontier." The author here attempts to present an accurate historical picture of the real Crockett. He does not minimize the importance of the Crockett myth, but does feel that overemphasis has produced serious damage by, for example, the "elimination from anthologies, of the only valuable Crockett work, the Autobiography," "an almost complete substitution in anthologies of the mythological character for the historical man," and by "a neglect of the historical man and of those documents which could form a basis for a fairer judgment of him" (p. ix). Shackford believes that a more balanced judgment of Crockett is called for. Rather "than that which dismisses him as an insignificant, vain, stupid, egotistical, and corrupted hack politician," Crockett's life should be viewed as "a tragic and yet a grandly victorious
story—the story of the destruction of our last frontiersman and of the birth of a new pioneer world citizen” (p. x). Because of the author’s illness, the manuscript was revised by his brother with the editorial assistance of the staff of the University of North Carolina Press.

The result of this effort is a creditable, although not always a readable or mature, biography. It traces Crockett’s activities from his parents’ migration into Tennessee, his advance to the middle then the western part of the state, his activities in the southeast during the Creek War of 1813-1815, his early political and military advancement in the years after the war and the death of his first wife, and his activities as a member of the state legislature. There Crockett early showed an interest in the distribution to actual settlers of lands in western Tennessee. From 1821 this “was to be the dominant interest of his life” (p. 49). Analysis of Crockett’s activities in the state legislature includes his leadership in the unsuccessful fight to defeat Jackson’s bid for the national Senate, and his first effort to advance to the national House of Representatives, his victory in 1827, and his subsequent career in Congress. In Washington, Crockett seems to have had three main ideas: support of a land bill and internal improvements favorable to settlers in western Tennessee and of a pension policy treating volunteers and regulars on equal terms. Crockett’s behavior was increasingly conditioned by a fierce anti-Jackson feeling (Shackford calls it a “monomania”), a feeling stemming in part from political rivalries in Tennessee. This feeling enabled Crockett to become a Whig in alliance with eastern leaders, an alliance which “must be seen in terms of his efforts in behalf of his land bill . . .” (p. 157). Crockett’s defeat for re-election in 1835 was followed, for reasons not made absolutely clear in this volume, by his last migration—to Texas. There he volunteered for military duty, sided with the anti-Houston faction, and in defiance of Houston’s orders found himself in the Alamo. In concluding his account of the historical Crockett, the author presents a eulogy (pp. 238-239) which suggests that he, like many others, found in his subject heroic qualities of which contemporaries might never have dreamed.

The final portions of this volume are, in many ways, the best. The last chapter, “Epilogue: David, the Legend and the Symbol,” analyzes the basis for the durability of the Crockett legend. This is followed by four excellent appendices, each examining the authorship of a major work attributed to Crockett. Shackford uses his evidence with caution, care, and resourcefulness. Noteworthy is the appendix devoted to the Autobiography, which Shackford calls “a classic of American history as well as of American literature” (p. 273).

This Crockett biography is accurate and reliable. The author has sought to sift fact from a veritable welter of myth. Any shortcomings the volume has stem from the paucity of available source material. Use of additional newspapers and manuscript collections might have produced additional data, although this is certainly debatable. Unfortunately, for this reviewer, at least, a full picture of Crockett does not emerge and, perhaps inevitably,
the legendary Crockett tends to fill in the void. There seems so little mate-
rial from which to fashion a portrait of David. Davy has been around so
long and is so everlastingly durable!

Muhlenburg College

JOHN J. REED


By JAMES MORTON SMITH. (Ithaca, N. Y.: Published for the Institute
of Early American History and Culture by Cornell University Press,
1956. xvi, 464 p. Appendix, bibliographical note, index. $5.00.)

At a meeting of a national historical society several years ago, when a
certain Senator from Wisconsin was a cloud no bigger than a man's hand on
the civil liberties horizon, the reviewer heard papers read on the two eras of
American history when a fear psychosis caused our government to place the
severest restrictions on the freedom of its citizens—the period of the anti-
Jacobin frenzy in the late 1790's and that of the Big Red Scare in the early
1920's. At the conclusion of the papers, a distinguished historian—distin-
guished as well for his patriotism as for his scholarship—leaped to his feet
and said: "Well, now we've heard the worst that can be said of us—and it
isn't so bad after all, is it?" Now, seven years later, with another crisis in
freedom behind us and the Senator from Wisconsin dwindled down to a
cloud no bigger than a shaken fist, we have a chance to catch a breath and
look back at our earlier episodes of national hysteria with the perspective
of a convalescent hopefully on the way to recovery. The judgment on all the
crises will be the same, I think, and it will be a twofold judgment. In the
first place, when you look into them carefully, they *were* pretty bad—not to
be compared, perhaps, with the blood purges and reigns of terror that other
nations have known, but genuine crises, all the same, in which the patient's
health and sanity were in serious jeopardy. And in the second place, the
recuperative powers of the American body politic after such convulsive
seizures have been truly remarkable.

James Morton Smith in *Freedom's Fetters* has given us the first really
thorough study we have had of the Alien and Sedition Acts and the pattern
of their enforcement. It is a solid and meticulous work of historical scholar-
ship with no journalistic flourishes, no explicit preachments, and no con-
scious references to recent events. Within its chronological limits—from the
spring of 1798 to the spring of 1801—the book is as admirable for its breadth
of coverage as for its depth of analysis. Mr. Smith starts off by sketching
swiftly the immediate background of the Alien and Sedition Acts—the
tension with revolutionary France culminating in the XYZ Affair and the
quasi-war. Then he takes up in satisfying detail the congressional history of
the major pieces of internal security legislation—the Naturalization Act,
the Alien Enemies Act, the Alien Friends Act, and the Sedition Act. From
here he passes to a careful review of the cases brought to trial under these acts and the associated prosecutions under the common law. The names of some of the victims are well known—Matthew Lyon of Vermont, James T. Callender of Virginia, Benjamin Franklin Bache, Thomas Cooper, and William Duane of Pennsylvania. (Mr. Smith's chapter on Duane, incidentally, first appeared as an article in this magazine.) Others are less familiar—John Daly Burk and Jedidiah Peck of New York, Anthony Haswell of Vermont, Charles Holt of Connecticut, Luther Baldwin of Massachusetts. (The last-named was found guilty of sedition for some drunken remarks about President John Adams' derrière.) Hitherto, the only systematic treatments of these cases have been Frank Maloy Anderson's pioneer essay on "The Enforcement of the Alien and Sedition Laws," published in 1912, and John C. Miller's lively, colorful, but superficial Crisis in Freedom (1951). Mr. Smith's judicious and unhurried account of this campaign of repression is likely to be definitive.

What emerges from Smith's sober, analytical pages is the inescapable conclusion that the Federalist Party, whatever its virtues, did not really care deeply about the liberty of the individual, that it was prepared to resort to harsh repressive measures to preserve its political power, that it seized upon the largely imaginary danger of French aggression as an excuse to cripple, if not to destroy, the Jeffersonian opposition. The debate on the Alien Friends Act went to the central issues of American government, and the Federalist spokesmen, relying on the common defense and commerce clauses of the Constitution, developed an argument which led straight to the omnipotent state. Like the debates on the other alien acts, it also disclosed an ugly vein of nativism, of hatred for foreigners, in the Federalist outlook. The Sedition Act with its "bad tendency" test, its enshrinement of the English common-law doctrine of seditious libel (in violation of the First Amendment), showed only too plainly that the Federalists put the state first, considered it the master, not the servant of the people. The leading Federalists all agreed on the wisdom and necessity of these measures. Mr. Smith effectively disposes of the widely current notion that Alexander Hamilton stood up as a courageous defender of civil liberties in these years; on the contrary, the record shows him advocating the most rigorous enforcement of the Alien and Sedition Laws. No one was more thoroughly committed to the position that government has a right to suppress all criticism and to banish aliens at will than John Adams, unless it was his wife Abigail. No one could have been more diligent and enthusiastic in enforcing the repressive legislation than his Secretary of State, Timothy Pickering. And the sponsors of these laws were no cheap, illiterate, rough-neck politicians; they were the patrician pillars of the Federalist Party, Harrison Gray Otis of Massachusetts and Robert Goodloe Harper of South Carolina.

In turning his spotlight on the antilibertarian laws of 1798, Mr. Smith has illuminated a most important aspect of Federalist political philosophy. He promises us a companion volume dealing with the reaction to this
massive attack on the American ideal of the free individual. That volume will have to come to terms with the questionable constitutionalism of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, but it will also bear witness to the remarkable resilience of the American civil liberty tradition.

Swarthmore College Frederick B. Tolles


This is the first book to deal at any length with clockmaking in Pennsylvania. With a lifelong interest in the history of Pennsylvania and in the art of clockmaking, the author has composed a series of short interpretive essays in which the two interests are fused to form an original work of considerable popular appeal and not a little enduring worth. It was written, as the author notes in his introduction, “to furnish the student, owner and prospective owner of Pennsylvania clocks, with information necessary to appreciate and enjoy their timepieces.” The author obviously enjoyed writing it, and the reader to whom it is addressed will enjoy and profit by Mr. Eckhardt’s wide-ranging collection of facts and his comments and interpretations. The book is in no sense a systematic treatise nor a comprehensive history of clockmaking in Pennsylvania. Being directed to a popular audience, it contains no conventional scholarly apparatus of footnotes or bibliography. It is, however, popularization at its best.

The first half of the book is made up of fifteen chapters dealing, in an informal journalistic style, with aspects of clocks made or used in Pennsylvania, the principles of their construction and operation, advice on how to repair them, rules for determining their present commercial values, anecdotes of famous clocks and of the men who made or used them, the origin of the term “grandfather’s clock,” clock music, the influence of Pennsylvania German folk art on the design of clock dials, the bells used with public clocks, and much more.

Illustrations, of which there are more than sixty, are accompanied by lengthy captions constituting, in effect, an independent chapter of the book, one which will, perhaps, be most interesting to collectors of clocks. The serious student will find the elaborate annotated list of Pennsylvania clockmakers, making up the concluding quarter of the volume, an indispensable guide to the identification and dating of the eight hundred clockmakers who worked in the state prior to the middle of the nineteenth century.

Facts and dates are, in the main, accurate. When doubt exists, the author is careful not to infer more than the evidence justifies. Occasionally he slips, as when the Kalendarium Pennsilvaniense for 1685 is described as “the first
American almanac,” and when the transit of Venus is stated to have occurred in 1768. There are a few surprising omissions. Nothing is said, for example, of the Philadelphia Clockmakers Company which flourished for a few years during the last decade of the eighteenth century, and nothing of the extensive and often amusing newspaper advertising employed by the clockmakers to describe their wares and to solicit patronage.

Portions of the text seem to have only a remote connection with Pennsylvania or its clocks. The English translation of Christiaan Huygens’ Horologium, originally published in Latin in 1658, is the only readily accessible English version of the first book to deal with the pendulum clock. As such it is of more than passing intrinsic interest, but its bearing upon Pennsylvania clocks seems to be too tenuous to justify its inclusion in a limited regional study of clockmaking in America. Much the same can be said of the chapter on William Molyneux, the Irish scientist, whose description of the equation of time has substantial technical interest but little direct relationship to subsequent clockmaking in Pennsylvania.

On the whole, however, Pennsylvania Clocks and Clockmakers is a sound and welcome addition to the literature of American craftsmanship. The author is to be congratulated on accomplishing so well his purpose of giving owners of Pennsylvania clocks information, appreciation, and enjoyment. Acknowledgment is due the publisher of the book for its superior typography.

Philadelphia

Penrose R. Hoopes


Between the Jacksonian era and the Civil War, one of the most significant patterns in American social history was the growth and development of agencies for the diffusion of knowledge among the American people. Professor Bode’s book contributes a valuable study of one of the most important of such agencies during those decades, the American lyceum. By employing both a chronological and geographical organization, he examines both the first phase of the lyceum movement—mutual instruction and random lectures—and the second phase after 1845, during which the lyceum crystallized into the lecture system, with reference to the development in New England, the Middle Atlantic states, the South and the Midwest. Such an organization achieves a clarity in the presentation of the material and serves to emphasize the sectional differences in the development of the lyceum.

Although mechanics’ institutes had existed earlier, the American lyceum movement received its impetus and its plan for local, state, and national organization from a Connecticut farmer’s son, Josiah Holbrook. Holbrook
suggested the following advantages of the lyceum: (1) that lyceums can diffuse education "more generally"; (2) that the information lyceums diffuse is practical; (3) that lyceums have "a good moral tendency"; (4) that lyceums have "a good political tendency"; (5) that lyceums are economical; and (6) that they will aid in the improvement of the common schools. How successfully such aims were fulfilled this study amply demonstrates.

Professor Bode relates the extraordinary growth of the lyceum movement to the optimistic years of the nineteenth century in which most Americans held firmly to a belief in self-improvement on both practical and cultural levels. Remaining free, for the most part, of controversial subjects, the lyceum offered learning at low cost, thereby answering the active desire for "adult education" and drawing wide support from American society. Beginning in New England and strongly supported in the middle states, the lyceums spread rapidly until they had reached Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Interesting contrasts are presented in the South where, lacking the broad foundation of middle and lower class support, the lyceum was less well developed.

In the communities where the lyceums drew large audiences, Americans received scientific instruction not only through lectures, but by observing the arithmometer, the orrery, and other scientific apparatus, manufactured and sold by Holbrook himself. Treated to such diverse topics as "The Cause of the American Revolution," "The Honey Bee," "The Education of Children," and "The Capacity of the Human Mind for Culture and Improvement," the public was able to choose many paths to increased knowledge. As the lyceum developed into an organized program of lectures, a galaxy of stars glittered from the platforms of the nation. Although controversial lecturers such as George Combe, the phrenologist, and Fanny Wright, reformer-at-large, were generally shunned by the lyceums, Emerson, Edward Everett, and Henry Ward Beecher increased their incomes as well as their fame traveling the lyceum circuit. Wendell Phillips spoke with as much passion on "The Lost Arts" as on abolition; John Gough stirred audiences with vivid two-hour accounts of his personal victory over alcohol. Bayard Taylor, robed in Arab costume complete with scimitar, described far-off lands, and Dr. Elisha Kent Kane's "Adrift in the Arctic Ice Pack" furnished information as well as vicarious adventure. History and biography reached a far wider audience in this popularized fashion than did more scholarly works. Countless titles, such as "Life is What We Make It" and "Life Considered as an Argument for Faith and Virtue," attest the appeal of the good spiritual life. One wishes for more analysis of the content of the lectures themselves which indicates as much about the character of nineteenth-century America as the popularity of the lyceums.

This study, however, adds much to our knowledge of the organization and importance of the lyceum as a social institution which popularized knowledge in the United States. Differences between the lyceum movement,
post-Civil War lectures, and the Chautauqua movement of the twentieth century are merely suggested at the conclusion of the volume, but this study makes clear that during the period before the Civil War the widespread and serious desire for education was well served by the American lyceum. The absence of footnotes should please the general reader for whom such an informative and interesting book will have interest; any irritation on the part of the specialist may be dispelled by references to sources within the text itself and in the bibliographical note.

Wellesley College  
Kathryn Turner

Lincoln and the Tools of War. By Robert V. Bruce. Foreword by Benjamin P. Thomas. (Indianapolis, Ind.: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1956. xvi, 368 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $5.00.)

The powerful, probing mind of Abraham Lincoln was capable of mastering many things—the law, politics, statecraft, military strategy, and the psychology of human beings. If Lincoln’s mind did not master the vast body of scientific knowledge that was emerging in the nineteenth century, it at least comprehended the implications of the coming of the machine age and the impact which the new technology would have on American society. Like most Americans of his time, Lincoln was fascinated and delighted with inventions, discoveries, and gadgets. While practicing law in Springfield, he had found time to prepare a popular lecture on “Discoveries and Inventions,” which represented the results of his wide reading in scientific subjects but seemed to bore the few audiences who heard it. Once he harbored brief dreams of being an inventor himself, devising and patenting an invention to buoy vessels over shoals. In his make-up he had much of the mathematician’s love for a problem to be solved and of the engineer’s habit of reflective analysis. He applied these qualities to his legal and political thinking. “I am never easy when I am handling a thought,” he said once, “till I have bounded it north, bounded it south, bounded it east, and bounded it west.” The man who would direct the nation in its first modern war was not exactly a scientific novice.

Lincoln’s role in formulating an arms policy for the United States during the Civil War is the subject of Robert Bruce’s fine book, Lincoln and the Tools of War, which is also the first comprehensive treatment of the subject of Northern arms developments. Bruce is one of the few people who could have written this book; he came to his task with an unusual background, having taken an undergraduate degree in mechanical engineering, served with the combat engineers in World War II, and finally secured a Ph.D. in history. Somewhere along the line he acquired a clear and charming literary style. The result is a volume that describes technological devices in a manner that the average reader can understand and that invests the human actors with flesh and blood. It is a story of guns and machines, but
it has also a gripping element of suspense. By any standards, it is a major contribution to Civil War literature.

Lincoln realized that the North's industrial superiority should give it a decisive weapons advantage over the South. During the first two years of the war, he searched for new and better weapons in much the same fashion that he looked for winning generals. Hampering his efforts, and the whole arms program of the government as well, was the ordnance organization, which combined the incompatible functions of research and production. Most ordnance officers, including the irascible Chief of Army Ordnance, James W. Ripley, believed that production came first. Convinced that the war would be short, they wanted existing standardized equipment used; they fiercely opposed innovations which, in their opinion, could not be produced quickly enough to affect the outcome of the war, or which, if introduced, would complicate the problem of supply. There was some merit in their position. Obviously, a major change in weapons would seriously disrupt production, and the sudden introduction of a variety of weapons would make it impossible to provide ammunition to fit them. But fundamentally they were motivated by hidebound conservatism and influenced by habits of mental inertia acquired in the small peacetime army. General Ripley seemed to be congenitally hostile to new ideas. The ordnance bureaus should have been responsible only for procurement, and an independent body, which today would be called a research and development agency, should have been charged with research. The nearest thing to such an agency in the Civil War was President Lincoln.

Lincoln took it on himself to listen to the inventors with new weapons, to order tests run of their devices, and, if he thought their ideas had value, to force the ordnance bureaus to purchase their equipment. Presidential pressure was largely responsible for the first government orders for breech-loading rifles and cannon, repeating rifles, mortar boats, and the forerunner of the machine gun that Lincoln christened the "coffee-gun." Lincoln was also interested in, and supported, experiments in signal balloons, rockets, flame throwers, submarines, and a new kind of explosive powder. In implementing his program, Lincoln sought the counsel of scientists bold enough to look into the future, including Joseph Henry of the Smithsonian Institution and John A. Dahlgren of Naval Ordnance, who became his chief weapons adviser. As one reads Mr. Bruce's pages, with their accounts of the numerous inventors, some of them crackpots, who came into Lincoln's office to demonstrate their weapons, the wonder deepens why the President was not assassinated before he was. It could have happened many times.

Professor Bruce's research, encompassing a vast variety of manuscript sources, including the files of the Army and Navy Ordnance Bureaus in the National Archives, gives a new dimension to Lincoln's role as commander in chief. And, as unbelievable as it may seem, his book throws new light on the amazing character of the most-studied American figure.

Louisiana State University

T. Harry Williams
Sickles the Incredible. By W. A. Swanberg. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956. xiv, 433 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $6.00.)

The biography of General Daniel E. Sickles, Sickles the Incredible, by W. A. Swanberg, is the second, the first being that by Edgcumb Pinchon, Dan Sickles, Hero of Gettysburg and "Yankee of Spain," which appeared more than ten years ago. There has also been a novel about Sickles by Constance Robertson, Salute to the Hero, which, although largely authentic, Swanberg does not mention in his bibliography.

Swanberg has produced a very readable biography, probably because he has been an editor of pulp magazines, and yet he has shown himself to be a good research student, having spent three years on this book. It is his first and is highly creditable to him. It renders obsolete Pinchon's biography which is replete with errors. It shows good judgment in the appraisal of such a complex personality as Sickles, deeming him neither the hero his soldiers thought him, nor an out-and-out villain because he had been a corrupt politician, killed a man in cold blood, and disobeyed orders, nearly bringing on the loss of the Battle of Gettysburg, where he lost a leg. Swanberg gives him credit for his ability, and even for his services as a military governor after the war and as minister to Spain, in spite of the fact that his careers as such ended in fiascoes. One of the valuable features of the book is the material the author has obtained through being given access to the war letters and journals of the Rev. Joseph H. Twichell, who had been chaplain of the Third Corps which Sickles had raised.

The most important part of the book is that which deals with Sickles' Civil War career, and which occupies far more than a third of the work. Sickles at the outbreak of the war, in spite of being a Democrat and not hostile to the South, raised troops and distinguished himself in the Peninsular Campaign and especially at Chancellorsville. His moving out his Third Corps from the line where Meade had wanted it stationed, which brought on great slaughter among his troops, has been the subject of controversy. Sickles all his life resorted to propaganda to show that he had brought on and won the Battle of Gettysburg. Strange to say, the men who fought under him and saw the great losses incurred by his disobedience sided with him. Swanberg does not refer to the two volumes of Pennsylvania at Gettysburg (1904) in which addresses are given by survivors on the occasion of the dedication of monuments to the Pennsylvania regiments who fought in the battle. Ten of these were under Sickles. A sergeant major of the 110th Regiment extolled him as faithful, courageous, patriotic and brilliant. The general concensus of military opinion, with a few exceptions, has condemned Sickles.

The chief merit of the book, however, is that it is not only generally accurate, but startlingly entertaining. One does not have here the usual dull account of a military and diplomatic career.

Yet a book may be faulty not by commission of error, but by omission of vital matters through unawareness of the whereabouts of important data,
by lack of proportion in space for events, and by poor arrangement of material. The author has sinned, not altogether un lamentably, in all these directions, and thus his book is marred, and cannot be the final word on Sickles.

First and foremost, Swanberg has overlooked more than sixty letters of Sickles to Buchanan in The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and as a result he has been inadequate in telling of Sickles’ career politically and of the part he played in having Buchanan nominated. While he has gone through the New York newspapers from the time of the Buchanan inauguration in 1857, he has with few exceptions not consulted the files for the previous ten years when events in Sickles’ career largely figured. He has depended for the facts of Sickles’ life for nearly his first forty years upon Pinchon and a few articles, notably one in Harper’s Weekly during the course of the trial of Sickles for the murder of District Attorney Philip Barton Key for a love affair with his wife, and an abusive article in the New York World at the time he was appointed minister to Spain.

Swanberg crowds the first thirty-four years of Sickles’ life (1819-1853) into ten pages. Even then the book does not begin with his birth and early years, but with an account of the sensational episode of the love affair and murder (1857-1859), and it gives a very brief, botched summary of the famous trial, which is not skillfully handled, Swanberg being no lawyer. Two and a half pages are devoted to it, and the name of Robert J. Walker, the most famous witness, and that of the presiding judge who disapproved of the outrageous verdict of acquittal are not even mentioned. It was a premeditated murder of the first degree.

Umbrage must be taken to the statement that Buchanan advised an eye-witness of the murder to clear out of town so as not to be called as a witness. President Buchanan was a lawyer and would know that had he given such advice he could have been tried himself as an accessory before the fact. This statement is based on a verbal report by this witness to his son from whom Swanberg learned of it.

While usually true to facts, Swanberg says that the written confession of her guilt by Mrs. Sickles, forced out of her by her husband, was published most likely through Sickles himself before the trial. As a matter of fact, it was published during the trial, and its publication was disavowed by a “card” by Sickles.

Philadelphia

Albert Mordell

The publisher's claim that Elizabeth Stevenson's biography is "the first comprehensive account of [Henry] Adams' life and work that has been written" is literally correct, but it should be read with emphasis on the word "first" rather than on the word "comprehensive." The book is comprehensive in the sense that it deals with Adams' life from birth to death. But compared with Ernest Samuels' biography, of which the first volume, The Young Henry Adams, was published in 1948, Miss Stevenson's has more the air of an extended essay, or biographical study, than a full-scale and thoroughgoing biography.

This is not to say that bulk makes excellence. The present study is a substantial one and in spite of certain limitations very welcome. For the time being, certainly, and perhaps for some time to come, it will serve as a good introduction to its important subject. There are many indications, however, that it will soon have competitors. The generation that Adams calculated was certain to "break its damn neck" in some cosmic smashup by 1930 or earlier has rather ironically produced a bumper crop of students of Adams' life and writings.

Miss Stevenson's is a more or less avowedly feminine approach to a man who was unusually dependent on women for inspiration, companionship, and, indeed, nearly everything, he sometimes thought, worth-while. She sees him as a kind of "seismograph," extremely sensitive to the tremors of his time and even "recording earthquakes of the future." This figure, encountered on page viii of the preface, almost discouraged the present reviewer from going on, for two reasons: first, a great deal too much has been made of Adams' powers of divination; and second, a work announced as a biography should be a biography and not an exploration of its subject's psyche. The effort of continuing was rewarded by a series of rather brief but spiritedly written chapters that increase in authority and suggestiveness as Adams reaches maturity. No one at all familiar with the voluminous collections of Adams' published letters will find a great deal that is new in the six or eight chapters through his Harvard professorship (1870-1877)—the point, incidentally, where Mr. Samuels' much more comprehensive first volume breaks off. But the several chapters that follow, on Adams' marriage and its mysterious and tragic ending, written with compassion but perfect taste, are full of valuable insights. Thereafter come the long wanderings to all quarters of the world; full-dress chapters on the History of the United States and the two curiously related books of Adams' old age, Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres and the Education—so easy to read on the level of narrative and description if one is not aware of other, baffling levels below; and glimpses of the old gentleman of Lafayette Square, who presented a Mephistophelean countenance to the world while finding his greatest pleas-
ure in entertaining in the gayest and most innocent fashion whole troops of real and adopted nieces.

In general Miss Stevenson is weakest when dealing with political aspects of Adams’ career, stronger on his literary affiliations, and most satisfactory of all on his relations with the many men and women whose devotion to him, in return for his to them, belied the satanism he so artfully cultivated.

Massachusetts Historical Society

L. H. Butterfield

(Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956. xvi, 192 p. Appendices, tables, charts, bibliography, index. $6.00.)

This monograph—No. 38 in the Research Studies of the Industrial Research Department of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce—portrays the fortunes and misfortunes of Philadelphia’s workers during a half-century afflicted with two world wars and a devastating business depression. Philadelphia, full of years and full of industries, affords a fertile field to explore the impact of major economic disturbances upon the working population.

The study begins with a short historical sketch of the rise of Philadelphia as a manufacturing center. With this as a background, Philadelphia is compared with other cities with respect to its industrial structure, types of manufacturing industries, scale of operations, characteristics of the labor market, and shifts in the economic functions of the city.

The importance of industrial Philadelphia is revealed by the growth of its population and the relatively high proportion of its citizenry of working age in the labor force. Changes in the age, sex, nationality, and skills of the labor force are traced from 1900 to mid-century.

In the spring of 1933, unemployment and part-time employment were so prevalent that only slightly more than one third of the city’s labor force was employed full time. Perhaps only the surviving victims of unemployment can fully appreciate the hard times that had to be endured in one way or another. The study explores this period of adversity, pointing up the incidence, duration, and costs of unemployment, hiring practices of employers, and work experience of the employed.

In Philadelphia, as elsewhere, substantially full employment was not restored until we become involved in World War II, and within a comparatively short time practically every able worker not in the armed forces was induced to enter the labor market. At the height of the war effort many workers were employed on government contracts by “garage and cellar industrialists.” In the summer of 1944, Philadelphia was declared a labor-shortage area to which no more war contracts could be awarded. Demobilization and reconversion after the war Philadelphia took more or less in
stride because the products made in this area were readily converted to peacetime use and because in Philadelphia, also, the wartime demand had been met for the most part by expansion of existing facilities rather than by the construction of new special-purpose facilities. Philadelphia's labor force, long known for its versatility and diversity of skills, became even more versatile as a result of the war, which broadened the work experience of both the industrial veterans and the newcomers into the labor force.

In the concluding chapter, the author examines the growth patterns of cities, the changing functions of cities, their vulnerability to structural and cyclical changes, planning efforts for the economic development of cities and employment policies. The examination is pursued at all times with the principal goal in mind of exposing deep and persistent underlying forces rather than the mere description of surface changes obvious to all who look.

The book is a durable contribution to the literature of labor economics. It bears unmistakable evidence of scholarly analysis, familiarity with the field, and mastery of the subject. It is well written, well documented, and adequately supported with tables, most of which are in the appendices. The book is not written for popular consumption, but is carefully written for the careful reader. Some readers may have to revise their preconceptions about mobility of labor, the relative importance of the "pulls" of opportunity versus the "pushes" of adversity, and the stabilizing influence of a diversified industrial pattern. For the most part, the analysis ends with 1950 data, which may disappoint a few readers interested in the effects on the labor market of the Korean upheaval.

Philadelphia

Evan B. Alderfer


How well does representative democracy acquit itself in wartime? This question, as concerns Congress, is here treated by a professor of political science at Northwestern University who, early in World War II, served as secretary to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The wartime job of Congress, he emphasizes, was not performed in a political vacuum. The United States, unlike Great Britain, did not suspend elections; political fortunes of individuals and parties continued at stake while survival of the government itself was threatened by foreign enemies. As the internal economy was placed at service to war-waging, Congress had to adjust its politics to that turbulent, fast-moving force—the dynamics of total war. Perforce, wartime politics became more complicated and sometimes more intense than peacetime politics.

Partisan assertions to the contrary, the Presidency did not convert to a
dictatorship, nor Congress to a rubber stamp. The influence of the President proved predominant in such areas of policy as over-all planning of political and economic action and in conceiving the grand strategy of war. Congress worked chiefly in three areas: (1) legalizing by laws—some broad, some specific—the delegation of powers to meet emergency needs; (2) adjusting conflicts of interests; (3) exercising oversight of the execution of policy.

As delegation of power often was imprecise, it led to considerable controversy over exercise of authority. In the areas where their interests conflicted, the struggle between President and Congress for the dominant role was wasteful of energy and unfortunate in later effects; for example, labor policy in origin tended to be executive, farm policy in origin tended to be congressional. While vigorous challenge from both directions precluded absolute control by either President or Congress, the particularized connotations had unwholesome after-implications.

In adjusting conflicts of interests over wartime reorganization of the nation's energies, Congress had to make difficult decisions on such crucial matters as the allocation of men, money, and materials among competitive claimants. Making political decisions became yet more complicated as the war added new standards for decision, while old standards were not wholly outmoded. For example, the standard of "equal sacrifice" was proved incapable of uniform application by the realignment of productive forces which is involved in development of a modern war economy. Price stability, consumer subsidies, salary limitations and war taxes were among other bones of political contention over conflicting interests.

In exercising oversight of executive policy, Congress seemed to do penance for delegation of power, actively examining the use of it and frequently denouncing bureaucrats for using powers granted them. By providing that all agencies created by the President must secure operating funds from Congress, some annual oversight was ensured. Also, Congress conducted more than one hundred particular investigations during World War II, finding them useful for such diverse purposes as good government, individual prestige, and political competition between members, the House and the Senate, and Congress and the Executive. The committee system exposed its strength and weaknesses, emphasizing, meanwhile, the lack of co-ordinated policy within the legislature and of mutual confidence between legislature and executive.

On balance, Young shows that although the scope of congressional action expanded, the authority of the executive branch was yet more greatly increased by the centripetal trends of modern war. Many congressional procedures developed for a by-gone era proved outmoded, especially as foreign policy has become vastly more important to United States survival. New procedures are needed.

This realistic survey is complemented by a congressional listing classified by party votes and by six charts based on voting records. The charts (although handicapped by too poorly differentiated symbols) demonstrate
the high degree of flexibility within party designations. This flexibility, in the opinion of this reviewer, has helped to save United States representative government from the splinter-party leukemia which seems to be destroying the democratic corpuscles in the political bloodstream of France and some other governments.

University of Pennsylvania

JEANNETTE P. NICHOLS

QUERY

Mrs. Jesse Slingluff, Jr., of 104 West Oakdale Road, Baltimore 10, Maryland, owns a letter written from Scranton by her great-grandmother Ann Cox Oakford on July 2, 1879. In this letter, Mrs. Oakford comments: "I am quite willing to accept Otto & Borga as my progenitors & can see now how the papers of Governor Printz's daughter came to be among those old papers of my father's, they were no doubt in the house on Tinicum island when Otto & Borga took possession." Query: does anyone know where the papers are today?