BOOK REVIEWS


Roger Williams is so widely known a figure of New England history that public parks, banks, and the like have been freely named after him in Rhode Island. Nor has he been honored only in Providence Plantations, for which he secured a charter in 1644; his imaginary likeness — there being no contemporary record of his appearance — adorns the Capitol in Washington and, across the Atlantic, the International Monument of the Reformation at Geneva. Yet in spite of the digging of numerous biographers during the past century and a quarter, little is known of his private life. Even the precise date of his birth is uncertain, and the record of many of his more significant decisions remains obscure and equivocal.

Arriving in Boston in February, 1631, Roger Williams was appraised by Governor Winthrop as "a godly minister." He needed a job in the worst way, yet when the best one in the Massachusetts Bay—that of teacher in the First Church in Boston—was offered him the following month, he is reputed to have refused it, slamming the door in his own face with outstanding determination. The reason—that he "durst not officiate to an unseparated people"—and, indeed, the whole incident, is known only through a letter that he wrote forty years after the event. His letters are few and far between. His thoughts are chiefly known through the eleven works he published in London between 1643 and 1676; his public life through the records of Providence town and the Rhode Island, Massachusetts Bay, Plymouth and Connecticut colonies.

Being a vigorous character, usually at odds with nearly everyone, Roger Williams has been posthumously claimed by a variety of admirers. His biographers have at various times advertised him in the titles of their works as “the pioneer of religious liberty,” “a political pioneer,” “prophet and pioneer,” “New England firebrand,” and “the irrepressible democrat.” Such phrases, although possibly helpful to sales, suggest that their coiners are sharpening historical axes. The unemotional title of this latest and admirable biography of Roger Williams is characteristic of its author.

Miss Ola Winslow is a mature scholar and a skillful literary craftsman, meticulous in research, modest in her claims, who approaches Roger Williams after years of familiarity with the religious writings of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England and New England. Her biography of Jonathan Edwards won a Pulitzer Prize; her Meetinghouse Hill, 1650-1783 was described in the American Historical Review as "one of those seemingly
easy triumphs of which few American historians appear capable." There is a
similar deceptive simplicity about Master Roger Williams, for Miss Winslow,
unlike eager graduate students with their way to make, strikes no attitudes
and thumps no drums. Instead she steeps herself in her subject over a long
period, exploring familiar and unfamiliar sources, and, when she comes to
write, does so with such ease and charm that her narrative is of absorbing
interest to the general reader, while fully but unobtrusively supported by
the necessary apparatus of scholarship. What more can one ask for?

Boston Athenaeum

WALTER MUIR WHITEHILL

Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip’s War. By DOUGLAS
EDWARD LEACH. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958. xiv,
304 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. $6.00.)

Douglas Edward Leach, Assistant Professor of History at Vanderbilt
University, has written what Samuel Eliot Morison, in his introduction to
the book, calls “the first comprehensive history of King Philip’s War to
appear since the seventeenth century.” It was an important war. In propor-
tion to population, Dr. Leach states, the war inflicted greater casualties
upon the people than any other war in our history. The line of English
settlement was pushed back and a number of communities destroyed or
partially burned. Though damaging to the English, it was disastrous to the
Indians. Their military strength was destroyed; the quasi-independent
status many groups had enjoyed was lost. They ceased to be an important
factor in New England life and politics.

Leach’s retelling of the tale, however, raises as many questions as it
answers. If King Philip’s War was an aggressive conspiracy among the New
England tribes to wipe out the English settlements, how can one explain the
following facts: (1) that the first blood in King Philip’s War seems to have
been shed by the English (pp. 42–43); (2) that early acts of hostility by the
Indians were casual, haphazard, and un-co-ordinated (pp. 48–49); (3) that
the war “spread” to the Narragansett Indians only when the English at-
tacked them for fear that they might later join Philip’s uprising (pp. 118–
119, 126); (4) that hostilities in the north began only after a local militia
captain, Samuel Moseley, had, without justification, burned a Pennacook
Indian village in the Merrimack Valley (pp. 84–85); (5) that hostilities
spread to the Connecticut Valley only after the English killed a number of
Indians near Hatfield who had fled from their town when the English at-
ttempted to seize their weapons (pp. 86, 94); (6) that what documentary
evidence of the Indians’ point of view exists indicates that they felt the
English were the aggressors (pp. 28, 160); and (7) that there is no proof of
any significant co-ordination among the various Indian groups engaged in
hostilities with the English (p. 164).
Professor Leach gives little weight to these important facts. He is so immersed in the literature of the war, the bulk of which reflects the English viewpoint, that he finds it easy to accept English suspicions, accusations, and interpretations as valid historically. We frequently read such sentences as "It was even suspected that Narragansett warriors were secretly participating in combat, which seemed to be confirmed by reports that wounded Indians had been seen moving toward the Narragansett country." We are not told whether the suspicions were ever proved valid or the reports confirmed. The sources probably do not give the answer. The historian as reporter must, it is true, let us know that such rumors existed; but the historian as judge must also tell us whether they were justified or not.

Professor Leach is perhaps too closely identified with his New England forebears properly to appraise the Indian position. The Indians are constantly described as "savages" and interpreted in a paternalistic and condescending fashion. Anthropologists would want to qualify the assertions that "government and law, like religion, seem to have been no more than vague concepts among these Indians," and that the natives had "originally no concept of personal and perpetual title" (p. 4).

Professor Leach gives grudging praise to the military capacity of the Indians, however. He points out that the English were constantly outsmarted and outfought by the red men until they adopted Indian modes of warfare and included friendly Indians in their expeditions. Indeed, the success of the English efforts seems to have been greatest when the number of English in the force was smallest. Captain Benjamin Church's brilliant successes in 1676 are explained not only by his own forceful leadership, but by his willingness to trust, respect, and use great numbers of Indian fighters. When Church laid the trap in which Philip met his doom, his men were stationed in pairs—one Indian, one white—around the swamp in which the Indian leader lay concealed. It was one of these Indians who killed King Philip. Church's most spectacular accomplishment, the capture of Annawon, Philip's trusted companion, was performed with a company consisting mostly of friendly Indians and only a handful of English.

In sum, Professor Leach has retold the story of Philip's War as the English saw it. But is it the true story?

Smithsonian Institution

Wilcomb E. Washburn


If accuracy and impartiality were the only scholarly virtues, then Desmond Clarke would be a great sinner indeed. Fortunately, there are
other virtues, not least the ability to write. And Mr. Clarke writes well. He is an experienced short-story writer as well as author of other, more serious, works. People interested in *Arthur Dobbs, Esquire* will find virtue and sin mixed, and it is perhaps a matter of preference which outweighs the other.

Dobbs himself epitomized an age and a class—country squire, amateur scientist, politician and economist, projector, reformer, imperialist. There are few readers who will not learn a little something new. The story moves quickly from one arena to another, from the Irish Parliament in the 1730's to Hudson Bay and a barren search for the Northwest Passage, and then on to North Carolina during the French and Indian War. The reader gets an economy tour, entering each arena only far enough to see Dobbs in action. Mr. Clarke presents much new material about Dobbs's appointment as governor of North Carolina, but almost nothing new about the period of governorship itself. Nevertheless, there is good value here for the student of American colonies in that he can see not just the colonial side, but all the variegated facets of a man typical of many who helped mold Great Britain's empire.

This being the case, more's the pity that Mr. Clarke's biography is marred by haphazard scholarship. References to printed sources are frighteningly inaccurate, quotations are sloppy. Some of the carelessness is truly extraordinary: in the handsome portrait which serves as frontispiece, Dobbs is described (p. 100) as holding a map of the Arctic regions. But the map shows up quite clearly in the photograph and is plainly labeled "North Carolina." Moreover, the author has not been at pains to investigate the secondary materials relating either to Dobbs or his associates. He does rank injustice to Governor Robert Dinwiddie (p. 108), but has not read Dinwiddie's biography. There is not a single reference to the *North Carolina Historical Review*, though relevant articles are there.

The reason for this indifference is apparent when one realizes how partisan Mr. Clarke is. Although Dobbs was a very controversial figure, almost never does Mr. Clarke side against him, but makes apologies whenever there is the least ground. Mr. Clarke seems to have taken for granted that the colonial situation really was what Arthur Dobbs thought it was. The treatment of New France reflects consistently Dobbs's own exaggerated view of a villainous interloper encroaching on the rightful possessions of the benevolent British. Mr. Clarke has been far more interested in presenting Arthur Dobbs as an attractive figure than he has been in a judicious, skeptical probing into the past.

Nor is the result all bad! An unexpected and delightful consequence follows upon this loyalty of author to subject. It is as if the reader comes to know Dobbs through his own eyes, as if the book were Dobbs writing about Dobbs. The role of the third party—the independent, quizzical researcher—is reduced to a minimum. Even Mr. Clarke's errors of annotation, his lack of impartiality seem Dobbsian. The man fills the focus of the book, just as his own grand schemes filled Dobbs's vision. No room for piddling diffi-
culties. I can see the eighteenth-century Irish Anglican now, as he barges ahead with some pet project, immoderate with detail, imposing in mind and figure, sure always of himself and of the rightness of his cause. That is the real worth of the book and one that does much to atone for the rest. The reader may not learn much, may indeed be misled here and there. But he will make the acquaintance of Arthur Dobbs, and that is worth doing.

Institute of Early American History and Culture

Michael G. Hall


Here, finally, American scholarship is finding its way back to the roots of American institutions in European culture. This thorough and diligently made collection of documents clearly reveals most of the sources of one of the more interesting religious groups which came to Pennsylvania—the Church of the Brethren, or Dunkards. As with the Mennonite groups, American scholarship here probes the deeper, more obscure sources, thus coming to understand the pattern of cultural forces which lay behind the migration of this group to America.

Mr. Durnbaugh, building on the basic exploratory work of Dr. Heinz Renkewitz in the records and archives of the Rhineland, has gathered and translated, with notes, the letters, official notices, council minutes, reports, interrogations, confessions and other vital materials from German, Swiss, French and Dutch sources—matter which illuminates the history of the Dunkard movement in Europe. He has utilized printed materials in many scattered collections, and he has also dug deeply into the manuscript collections in Karlsruhe, Heidelberg, Weimar, Strassburg, Basel, Buedingen, Marburg, Laasphe, Bonn, Krefeldt, Amsterdam, and elsewhere. There is not much that he has missed. All together, these materials make about two hundred twenty-five items, a first-rate source book of inestimable value to those of us who are interested in the sources of American ideas and social forms, a work which brings these useful materials to hand. These materials are arranged in six chapters: Separation, Formation, Expansion, Suppression, Emigration, Publication.

There are, however, risks which a compiler takes in thus assembling sources. He must take what he can get. He cannot balance his material. This work then suffers, through no fault of the compiler, from the fact that several important aspects of early Brethren history are not represented simply because there are no materials available to represent these phases. The compiler has diligently dug out what was there to be found; he has
competently presented the available materials; but this book, nevertheless, retains areas which it does not cover where we could wish for documents. Two such areas come immediately to the mind of this reviewer: the first area, hinted at in Heinz Renkewitz's great biography of Hochmann von Hohenau, is the precise relationship between the early Brethren and this stirring leader of spiritual religion. We still do not know, beyond the few hints which appear in the present work, just what this relationship was. A second area of paucity of material is the relationship between the early Brethren and the Inspirationist movement. Mr. Durnbaugh has translated Eberhard Ludwig Gruber's questions to the Brethren, with their answers, but there is precious little to explain why Gruber should be the catechist of the Brethren. This second area is especially sensitive to criticism because the Chronicon Ephrataense acknowledges that the Inspirationists were one of the two significant influences upon that branch of the Brethren movement.

These faults, however, are not the compiler's. They arise from the nature of the surviving documents. Perhaps imaginative search of the printed records of the Inspirationist movement would uncover other references—who knows?

On the whole, we have here the bedrock of history, a competent, useful, and to some of us even thrilling work which digs into materials which up to now have been little known. It now remains for Mr. Durnbaugh to turn his attention to an even more thrilling theme—the American Sources of the Brethren.

Norristown

JOHN JOSEPH STOUDT


George Whitefield's name is so closely associated with the Great Awakening, which had a widespread influence on American colonial life in the middle of the eighteenth century, that we take up a book about him with the eager hope of finding something new regarding this popular preacher. The author, Professor Stuart C. Henry of Southern Methodist University, has painted the personality of Whitefield in colorful terms.

Whitefield had a friendly, outgoing nature. He was warmhearted. By means of a handshake he could win a friend for life. In the pulpit his personal magnetism held people spellbound. His mellifluous voice captivated the actor Garrick. His voice was so powerful that practical-minded Benjamin Franklin estimated 30,000 could easily hear him.

Whitefield came of lowly parentage in England, attended Oxford where he was spiritually stimulated by Charles and John Wesley, and was ordained in the Church of England. Immediately he began evangelistic tours and was
helped by parish clergy until he began criticizing them as unregenerate. When the churches were closed to him he began preaching in the fields to increasing crowds.

Whitefield, at the suggestion of Wesley, went to America where he founded an orphanage in Georgia and preached to vast crowds up and down the Atlantic coast. To a young man in his early twenties such popularity and adulation were bound to go to his head. There are many evidences of Whitefield's pride and conceit. As an example, he used highhanded tactics in seizing orphans from private homes. He compared himself to the Apostle Paul with a thorn in the flesh, and like the Master he went up into a mountain and the multitudes came to him.

The author devotes a chapter each to Whitefield's faith and to his theology which were at variance with each other. His theology held that man was helpless and that God alone took the initiative for man's salvation. But Whitefield's faith proclaimed that God loves man and is eager to have men come to Him. By vivid word pictures Whitefield played on the emotions of his hearers, casting thousands into a wailing despair over their souls until they found peace. These emotional excesses and outbreaks brought heavy criticism of Whitefield from the more dignified clergy. People never seemed to be neutral about him. Either they were all for him, or they vigorously opposed him. This was true not only among churchmen, but also in the secular community.


Although the author concludes that Whitefield was an outstanding success, he almost overweights the picture with illustrations of criticisms. In the final chapter he presents the secret of Whitefield's success.

The book is artistically printed with large type and wide spacing between the lines. Its attractive format invites reading. An extensive chronology for the life of George Whitefield compensates for the fact that this is not a biography but a sketch of the man and an appraisal of his message. A minor error states that on December 9, 1738, Whitefield was "received favorably by Archbishop of Canterbury," but Gillies states that "tho the archbishop of Canterbury . . . received him civilly, it was but coldly." A bibliography and an index add to the book's value. The author's flowing style is an asset.

As the reader lays down the book he is grateful for a recent interpretation of the leader of the Great Awakening, but he also wishes he might have found some fresh material. And he misses a presentation of that larger influence of Whitefield on higher education and philanthropy in America, and on the preparation of the colonists for independence and nationhood.
Ill-Starred General: Braddock of the Coldstream Guards. By Lee McCardell. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958. xii, 335 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. $6.00.)

It is a tribute to Mr. McCardell’s style, and to his scholarship, that this is a readable book, despite two serious defects. One defect is that Braddock has only a tenuous and shadowy existence in the first half of the book, which is essentially a sketch of the society that produced him. The other lies in the cursory treatment accorded the climactic day of Braddock’s life, the day of his defeat at Monongahela. Of minor faults the book is remarkably free (except for the misspelling of “Hanoverian”). McCardell’s documentation is meticulous, and his writing is in the best tradition of American journalism, which puts it above the average historian’s standard.

Undoubtedly there is a dearth of source material for the greater part of Braddock’s life. He seems to have just missed involvement in most of the great events of his time. Thus, he obtained his ensigncy the very week, in 1710, that the Tories were voted in to make peace. For thirty years he was quartered in and around London: in summer camp in Hyde Park, in winter quarters in the Tower, on guard duty at St. James’s. In the Forty-Five he got as far as Litchfield, but never saw the army of the Pretender. The following year he and his men embarked for France, landed again, re-embarked, toured the Bay of Biscay, and returned to Plymouth without ever seeing the French. “The guards,” Walpole wrote, “are come back too, who never went.”

During all these years, Braddock kept to his duty, was occasionally promoted, and earned a reputation for competence in an incompetent society. He also seems to have acquired a reputation for coarseness in a coarse society. McCardell does his best with the scraps of evidence he can find that bear on Braddock, filling in his narrative with a pleasant account of the more exciting events of the times. It is perhaps not his fault that, halfway through the book and almost all the way through its subject’s life, the reader still does not know what sort of man Braddock was, does not know why he was thought to be rude and bad-tempered, or why he had never married, or what his opinions about anything were.

The most satisfactory part of the book is the account of the preparations for the expedition to take Fort Duquesne. This must have been a miserably frustrating affair for Braddock to direct. He had, to begin with, two badly run-down regiments from the Irish Establishment, the 44th and 48th Footguards. These, filled up to strength by raw American recruits, had to form the core of his force. He had an enormous distance to go, over a badly chosen route, through nearly unmapped country. He got little help from the colonies he had come to defend: Maryland was apathetic, Virginia inefficient, and Pennsylvania, except for Benjamin Franklin, rooted in its sly, calculating pacifism.

Everything went wrong. The Indian auxiliaries whom Governor Dinwiddie had faithfully promised, never arrived. The ramshackle colonial
governments failed time and again to provide proper supplies—many of the horses sent were jades; meat turned out not to have been pickled, and had to be buried; flour was delivered souring in green casks. The wonder was that, despite all his discouragements, Braddock organized and made one of the most remarkable marches in British military history, building his road as he went, arriving at last within seven miles or so of Fort Duquesne. There his army was massacred and he himself mortally wounded by a disorganized force of Indians and Frenchmen numbering scarcely half that of his own army. In the course of one terrible afternoon, Braddock became a leading member of the select company of brave but foolish British generals.

McCardell's account of the Battle of Monongahela is marred by the inclusion of various legendary bits of dialogue, principally between Braddock and Washington. More important, however, McCardell fails to analyze the reasons for Braddock's defeat. Why did Gage fail to reconnoiter ahead and discover the deadly ravine, and why did he fail to secure the hill on the right, when such routine precautions had been a normal observance during the whole march? Why was the advance party so close to the main body, and why did Braddock advance the main body instead of disposing it for defense? Why, in defiance of Humphrey Bland's *Treatise of Military Discipline*, was Braddock marching his force through enemy woods in a double column of two, instead of by platoons? Such questions as these McCardell neither raises nor answers.

Perhaps sometime, someone will tell not merely *how* Braddock was defeated, but essentially *why*. Was it because he was a parade grounds officer, who had spent his life moving men from place to place, not fighting them on the way? Or does it go deeper than this, deep into the British military tradition? After all, a hundred thirty years after Braddock, another British major general marched his men across a thousand miles of impenetrable wilderness, only to be defeated in the Battle of Fish Creek by sixty-two French Indians lying in a little ravine on the Saskatchewan prairie.

The Rice Institute

W. H. Nelson


*The Southeast in Early Maps* is a fundamental contribution to American historical cartography and, also, a valuable new guide to the understanding of the discovery, exploration, and development of the southeastern region of the United States in the period before the American Revolution. The student of early cartography, and especially of the early American scene, will find this work a refreshing study and summary of the mapping of the
area which stretches from the Old Dominion State to the Florida Keys. He will find it, too, an invaluable aid to further studies and a scholarly summary of the known cartographical information in this particular field of study. To all who are interested in the early history of this historic region this book will present a valuable new approach, an approach not concerned especially with the contrast of these early maps and the finished maps of today. Instead Professor Cumming urges the study of these maps together with those preceding them and those that immediately followed. Only in this way can we see the gradual evolvement of the graphic story of exploration and geographical growth these portray. In this way, too, we can obtain a truer appreciation of these maps and plans, rough and polished alike, of this area as the true historical documents that they are.

The book opens with an excellent, interpretive essay concerning the early important maps of this region and their historical milieu. The essay is at once a very informative introduction for the list of maps which comprises the main part of the book and also a definite contribution to the understanding of the complexities of its geographical development. Following this essay is a section of sixty-four fine collotype reproductions of some of the key maps discussed in the introduction and described in detail in the list which follows. The plates have been prepared by the Meriden Gravure Company and reflect their usual high standards of presentation. The third section presents a thoroughly analyzed, chronological list of the key manuscript and printed maps of the region and an exhaustive list of "the Local Maps and Plans of the Region South of Virginia and North of the Florida Peninsula." The author feels that both the maps of Virginia and Florida are adequately described in other sources and that to redescribe them here would repeat already available information. The list itself is a model of descriptive map bibliography. The physical description of each map is accompanied by a short interpretive summary of the map, locations of copies in a number of large collections in the United States and in Europe, and a listing of reproductions and references.

To those who have been eagerly looking forward to the publication of this book, it fulfills all expectations and more. It is a welcome addition to a growing scholarly literature describing our early American maps and a leading example of the furthering of our understanding of our historical and geographical development through their use.

William L. Clements Library


This volume treats a long unanalyzed aspect of the American Revolution: the part played by newspapers in "fueling the discontents that flamed into
Independence.” Portions of this theme were explored by Professor Schlesinger in articles published some twenty years ago; now we are presented the first comprehensive account of “the newspaper war” from 1764 to 1776, when the “real” revolution transpired.

A revolution occurred in journalism, Schlesinger discovers, as well as in politics. Set in motion amid Stamp Act upheavals, it saw publishers flaunting that statute with impunity, newspapers transformed into journals of opinion, prerogative controls over the press disintegrating. The alliance between politics and journalism, so fateful for later contentions, was then permanently sealed. Effected by popular initiative, it produced a nearly unanimous patriotic posture among newspapers throughout the Stamp Act troubles. Prerogative spokesmen, unable to restrain the new journalism, were impelled to promote connections for themselves with the press to combat its “licentiousness.” The resulting collisions, with the issues of dispute and the relationships which printers bore toward them, are here unfolded on a continental scale, from the beginnings of opposition to the Townshend measures up to the Declaration of Independence.

The patriot newspapers, it is shown, brought substantial support to the continental line adopted against the Townshend program; the Boston press set a pattern imitated elsewhere. After partial repeal shattered this unity in 1770, extremist Boston journals, with little support from outside, struggled to keep alive a sense of grievance during an interval of “sullen silence.” A very full exposition of newspaper activity from 1773 onward analyzes the reforging of intercolonial bonds in the “crusade” against the East India Company (when, it appears, the design of the Tea Act was skillfully unraveled in the prints); the impetus supplied by the press, in the wake of the Coercive Acts, to the demand for a continental congress, and the clarification which journalists gave to the constitutional and economic issues in question; the service performed by newspapers in enforcing the mandates of continental and provincial government; the passing of journalistic leadership after Lexington from Boston to Philadelphia, where occurred the final debates respecting modes of opposition, resolved ultimately by independence. At every crisis on this journey, Professor Schlesinger demonstrates, the American cause was vigorously espoused and the issues illuminated by a patriotic press, without which, he asserts, the independence movement “could hardly have succeeded.”

This is by far the most distinguished study of early American journalism that has yet appeared. It offers a remarkable range of interpretation and suggestion, and presents a good deal of new material. The contexts in which colonial publishers worked are amply set forth. There are penetrating insights into freedom of the press as an issue of the period which had determining significance for a later time. Some of the interpretations advanced, to be sure, invite challenge. It is questionable, for example, whether the role ascribed to John Dickinson in formulating the doctrine upon which Boston leaders founded their opposition to the Townshend measures can be sus-
tained. There are a few significant omissions: of newspaper opinion during the Stamp Act crisis, and the connections between English and American journalism. Certain key themes perhaps deserve more precise analysis, the journalists' critique of parliamentary jurisdiction in America, for example. Can it not be determined when the conception of dominion status became a point of orthodoxy among popular writers? It appears, moreover, that the agency of "editors" in the newspaper war is both confused and unduly stressed. The "editorial" function of publishers at the time consisted chiefly in the acceptance or rejection of contributed opinion. Few exercised that discretion with enough consistency or commitment to merit the "Whig" and "Tory" labels Professor Schlesinger assigns. Often too narrowly focused upon the purveyors of opinion, his account leaves inadequately probed the doctrines and strategies which the opinion-makers—the anonymous band of volunteer journalists—developed in the press. Was it not their triumph this work should have celebrated?

University of Michigan

Roger B. Berry


This is the second of two volumes, the first of which appeared in 1953 and was reviewed in the January, 1954, issue of this magazine. The vast amount of research which has gone into the compilation of this work was commented upon at that time. It is apparent on every page of this volume, too, and is the sort of thing which is taken for granted from our most distinguished Swedish-American historian.

At the time of the American Revolution it was the policy of the Swedish government to encourage its naval officers to take service with the navies of other powers, principally French and Dutch, for the sake of the battle experience which they might gain thereby. These officers made frequent reports, still preserved in the Swedish archives, to their superiors, and are the principal source for Dr. Johnson's present work. His first volume was concerned with the naval engagements, in other parts of the world as well as in American waters, in which Swedish officers participated, and with the part they played therein. Volume II consists of biographical sketches of these Swedes, with numerous examples of their letters and reports, and extracts from other unpublished documents of the period, all of which throw light on the naval history of this "world war" of 1776–1783.

While the biographies are mostly those of officers, the author has included common sailors whenever he could locate them. There are quite a few such in his chapters on "Swedes in American Service" and "Swedes in English Service." Common sailors in the latter group were often victims of the press
gang. Neither they nor their compatriots in the officer class can be called contributors to American freedom; but, as Dr. Johnson explains in his preface, the material was available, so he decided to enlarge the scope of his work by adding this section (not a very large one) on Swedes fighting to suppress American freedom.

Even war has its diversions, and Dr. Johnson finds an entertaining one in his story of the beautiful Eloise Hick, whose name should be added to the roster of American belles who have expatriated themselves in the cause of love. Of a well-to-do, probably Tory family, Eloise spent the war years in London, where, at the close of the conflict, she met a dashing young Swedish officer. They fell in love, he "rushed off" and married her, and then unencourageously sent her on ahead to Sweden to make peace with his family. Her grace and charm proved equal to the task—even the King was favorably impressed with her—and Eloise lived happily in Sweden ever afterward, though with another husband.

This volume, like its predecessor, is lavishly illustrated and handsomely printed and bound.

*University of Delaware*  
*H. Clay Reed*


Billy Bartram was twelve years old when his father, writing from Kingsessing on the Schuylkill River, described him to his London correspondent, Peter Collinson, as "my little botanist." Within a year or two his drawings of flowers, birds, snakes, fish, and turtles were going across the Atlantic to win the respect of London naturalists.

High standards of accurate observation were set for him by his father, John Bartram, when they went into the field; and high standards of draughtsmanship were set in his father's library, for its treasures were Sir Hans Sloane's *Natural History of Jamaica* and Mark Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina, Florida and the Bahama Islands.* But drawing, which was Billy's obsession, was permitted only on Saturday afternoon and Sunday, for his father insisted upon schoolwork which included Latin and French.

Perhaps that schooling helped him to record his exploration of Georgia and Florida and to write the *Travels,* which was published in London in 1791 and pictures the wilderness of southeastern North America and its inhabitants, as they remained in the eighteenth century.

The new edition which Francis Harper has given us allows William Bartram to speak with all the freshness of a contemporary chronicle. But curious persons, to use Collinson's phrase for naturalists, can turn to the appendices. They contain the mass of knowledge about the Creek Indians,
their friends and foes, and the flora and fauna of North America that Francis Harper has accumulated in years of devotion to the subject. He has spent as much time in the field as did his great predecessor, tracing on foot and in an automobile the trails which Bartram followed on horseback. Questions outside of his own wide area of competence are referred to ethnologists and other specialists.

One of these specialists was a yachtsman who explored the St. John's River to locate the islands and bluffs where Bartram's adventures took place on his one-man sail of a hundred miles through virgin Florida forest. Evidently, William's mastery of the art of long distance travel on a horse, gained from trips with his father, had been complemented by sailing on the Schuylkill, for he embarked with confidence in a newly purchased Florida sailboat, rather relieved that his proposed companion decided to stay ashore. He found the wilderness interrupted only by an occasional indigo or rice plantation, managed by an Englishman and worked by Africans.

Identification of the trees, shrubs, and plants named by the Bartrams is a game that many have played, botanists and amateurs alike. John Bartram began it when he sent dried and living plants and seeds to Peter Collinson. Collinson studied the dried specimens, and planted the seeds and the living plants in his gardens in the London suburbs. Consulting with Philip Miller of the Chelsea Physic Garden, Dr. Dillenius of Oxford, and even with Linnaeus himself, he applied to the plants from North America the names that Parkinson, Tournefort, and Linnaeus had used for their European cousins and wrote to Bartram about them. John Bartram had become acquainted with the work of Linnaeus before William was born, through the interest of James Logan; and he acquired for himself, through Collinson, the published work of Miller, Tournefort, Dillenius and Linnaeus. These books were the source of young William's botanical knowledge.

But to translate eighteenth-century nomenclature into that of current systematic botany requires the thorough work of a scientist. That has been performed by Francis Harper. He has visited the ground covered by Bartram, studied the plant and animal life as it now exists, compared the nomenclature of the eighteenth century with that of today and arrived at answers to most of the difficult questions. These are contained in the annotated index.

Examples of William Bartram's drawings and reproductions of old maps illustrate this edition. It was the drawings that convinced Dr. John Forthergill that William was worth financing, although now they seem crude and not altogether reliable by comparison with the work of a camera in the hands of Allen Cruickshank or Roger Peterson.

The Yale University Press has published this classic of American literature in a format which makes it available to a wide public. There is no better introduction either to eighteenth-century America or to natural history.

_Schenectady, N. Y._

WINIFRED NOTMAN PRINCE

In the eighteenth-century America of poor communications and diverse local attitudes, the construction of political machinery was a gigantic task. Furthermore, the deep-seated suspicion of political parties as incompatible with honest republican virtue was a real article of faith among the founding generation of leadership, while the average American concealed his interest in his nation's political experience under a traditional contempt for politicians. Hence, this able account of how the necessities of democracy produced party organization and of the origins and techniques of such organization is particularly interesting.

According to Professor Cunningham, national parties as distinct from mere personal factions began in late 1792, and developed so rapidly that by 1794 "the pattern of national party development had been set," and by 1796 national parties were "rather sharply defined." Among the elements in this process of definition were the establishment of the party press, the rise of the Congressional caucus for both legislative and nominating functions, the development of committee systems for information and uniform action, the beginnings of interstate co-operation, the use of the party ticket of candidates, the assumption of leadership by professional politicians, and the evolution of party strategy in Congress based on careful estimates of popular opinion. These developments (in which the Republicans as the party out of power necessarily pioneered) did not pass unchallenged by citizens imbued with civic idealism, but idealism perforce gave way to practicality, so that by 1800 the formerly despised partisanship had to many become "firmness" and "personal stability," and party organization had revolutionized campaign practices, election procedures, "the concept of what public men should be and do," and the general attitude toward politics as a profession.

In his account of political history Professor Cunningham deals firmly with some formerly cherished theories. Parties, he holds, were national in origin. They were chiefly inspired in Congress from national issues, were held together by national figures, and were directed through practices at the national capital (such as the Congressional caucus), while state political organization, with the possible exception of Pennsylvania's, was rudimentary and consisted mainly of mere personal factions until invigorated and oriented by national leadership and events. Further unusual conclusions are that Burr's New York strength did not derive from Tammany but from his control of Republican organizational committees; that the Jay Treaty was a helpful but not crucial event in party organizational history; that the Democratic-Republican societies were more pressure and propaganda groups than political organizations; and that the onset of European war in 1793 was not particularly important in speeding up party development.
As for Jefferson's role, the author believes that the Secretary's early contributions were essentially collaborations with a Congressional group led by Madison, and that after his retirement from the Cabinet he withdrew entirely from active leadership while Madison directed the gradual evolution of the party. Upon his return to public life in 1797, however, Jefferson became the party's leader in every sense—directing strategy, creating political alliances, formulating policy, and serving as a clearinghouse for party publications. "With the drafting of the Kentucky Resolutions," Professor Cunningham says, "Jefferson began his campaign for the presidency." This campaign "brought the most significant progress in the development of formal party organization that had yet been witnessed in the United States," and when it was over, parties, both on the national and local scenes, had become so firmly rooted in American political practice that the Constitution itself was amended and interpreted to fit their growth.

Criticism of this unbiased and scholarly book merely expresses differences in emphasis. For example, while accepting the author's belief that 1789 began a new departure in American political development, one may still wonder if colonial precedents did not significantly color Jeffersonian practices. Also, while primary sources are obviously vital to such a book, more attention might occasionally be given to a writer's personal bias, as in the case of Matthew L. Davis' estimate of Burr's contributions in 1800. Such possibilities are, however, not derogatory to this valuable and clearly written story of our early political beginnings.

W. H. Masterson


This interesting addition to recent literature concerning the early national period departs considerably from the traditional interpretation of John Adams as an inept political leader whose sole accomplishment as President was the negotiated peace with France in 1800. In such a revision, Hamilton emerges as a political chieftain of less than consummate skill, blundering in the attempt to force elimination of Adams in favor of Pinckney in the election of 1796, a maneuver which put the President and his supporters on the defensive at the outset of the administration prepared for a showdown with Hamilton. Mr. Kurtz indicates that Adams then sought rapprochement with the Republicans only to have such an alliance rejected because of the crippling implications for the future of their party which such support would entail.

The volume includes a valuable section on patronage and the Adams Cabinet. The Hamiltonian allegiance of Pickering, Wolcott, and McHenry is well known, but reasons suggested for the retention of the Washington
Cabinet and discussion of the administrative problem in securing able men for national public office are indeed informative.

Most crucial to the evaluation of the conflicts of the Adams administration is the interpretation presented of the purpose of defense measures undertaken by the Federalists during the period of crisis between the United States and France. It is Mr. Kurtz's contention that scholarly attention to the Alien and Sedition Acts has so overshadowed the Adams administration that the importance of the army, "the most significant single issue of that violent four-year period," has been underestimated. By opening negotiations with France, he continues, Adams put an abrupt end to the plans of "the vindictive, militaristic" faction of the Federalist Party which anticipated the domestic uses to which a sizable army might be put and hoped for the cohesive force of foreign war to salvage dwindling political fortunes. Mr. Kurtz argues that Adams wisely assessed the sentiment in the nation for peace, acted boldly upon this in seeking an accord with France, and gambled that the Hamiltonian wing of the party would be forced to follow his lead. Diagnosing this situation as both politically wise and nationally expedient, the author concludes that Adams enhanced rather than destroyed his chances for re-election.

We are faced here with a dual problem in interpretation, the two parts of which need not necessarily be related. Undoubtedly some Federalists contemplated the values of a standing army which could be used to quell future domestic disturbances; certainly some Republicans voiced fears that measures ostensibly undertaken for defense were simply subterfuge to acquire an arm of enforcement more powerful than the courts in silencing opposition to Federalist legislation. However, a single letter from Hamilton to Dayton proposing (among other suggestions) a permanent army is scanty evidence to warrant the conclusion that the army was to be used against the Virginia "insurrection." The author acknowledges that historians have tended to reject this thesis; it is unlikely that this volume will occasion a wholesale change of mind on this point.

It seems to me that Mr. Kurtz is on much sounder ground in his presentation of substantial evidence indicating that an army and continued hostilities with France were indispensably necessary if the joint Anglo-American force contemplated by Hamilton, King, Pickering, McHenry and others was to strike successfully at Spain in Louisiana and Florida and meet with Miranda in Central America. The intention of powerful Federalists in this dream of glory need not rest on inference, and, unquestionably, any measure taken to make peace with France, hence rendering a military establishment unnecessary, would puncture the possibility of such conquest. If ulterior motives underlay Federalist arguments for an army of "preparedness," the evidence is more persuasive in terms of plans for new world conquest than suppression of domestic dissidence. Clearly demonstrated is the fact that quarrels over the army question had badly fractured the party by the time Adams announced his intention to accept peace feelers from Paris.
From this point, Mr. Kurtz moves to the second aspect of his interpretation, the political skill of John Adams. He argues that Adams seized peace as the profitable political issue in 1799 and deliberately pursued a course independent of the Hamiltonians in order to take the issue of a standing army away from the Republicans, spare the country a needless war, and, by so doing, win re-election. This view is persuasive to a certain point. Despite the howls of the Hamiltonians against Presidential policy, once an honorable peace seemed possible, merchants desirous of trade with French colonial possessions advocated peace, public interest in the need for an army decreased, and protests against the Federalist tax program and sedition acts increased. Mr. Kurtz credits Adams with skillful political initiative here, claiming that his disassociation from the Hamiltonian Federalists was “a split . . . purposely widened and emphasized by the President during 1799 and 1800 after he concluded that the Hamiltonians would not follow where he had led.” The mission to France capped this policy, and upon the understanding of this by the voters Adams presumably based his hopes for re-election.

Tempting as such an interpretation is, we are left hungry for a more conclusive connection between the fact that Adams did add to his strength in 1800 and the hypothesis that he planned it by this particular means. Essentially, we come to rest here on the interpretation of the intention of John Adams, but we find no evidence whatever that Adams knowingly directed his course with the discernment and acumen attributed to him. The thesis portrayed is an attractive one—it makes such perfect political sense, the intelligent gamble which a keenly intelligent politician might be expected to make. That Adams was such a political practitioner in this instance is not convincingly demonstrated. So provocative and well-written a reassessment of the period, however, is certainly to be welcomed with gratitude. Appendices concerning the election of 1796 increase the value of the study.

Wellesley College

Kathryn Turner


There were giants in the Senate in the time of Andrew Jackson. One of them was Thomas Hart Benton, five times a Senator from Missouri, the subject of Elbert B. Smith’s new biography. For a giant, Benton has suffered a tremendous decline in reputation, not by being discredited, but by being forgotten. Clay, Calhoun, and Webster are well remembered, but the average American is unlikely to recognize Benton’s name, and even educated men are likely to confuse him with the Missouri artist, his brother’s grandson.
Yet historians have necessarily held Benton in their remembrance. When the American Statesmen Series was being published by Houghton Mifflin Co. toward the end of the nineteenth century, a place was made in it for a life of Benton and, apparently at the suggestion of Henry Cabot Lodge, Theodore Roosevelt was secured to write it (according to Carleton Putnam's new biography of Roosevelt). About twenty years later, a half-century after Benton's death, two more biographies appeared, the better of them by William M. Meigs and published, like *Magnificent Missourian*, by Lippincott.

Then another half-century passed before anyone again published a biography of Benton. And now at last, doubtless stimulated both by the revival of interest in the Jackson period and by the need of a new Benton study utilizing all the source materials turned up in the twentieth century, two biographies of Benton have appeared within two years.

Both are good. The first, *Old Bullion Benton*, by William N. Chambers, is longer and more detailed than Elbert Smith's book. Smith has been able to profit from Chambers' research, particularly on Benton's background and early years, but he has sought not to add to Chambers' work but to present a shorter, more succinct account of Benton's career. I think he succeeds. For the scholar there is no particular need for Smith's book in view of the fact that Chambers' book offers more details and is more carefully documented. But for the general reader, Smith's book has the advantage of being the shorter by more than a hundred pages and therefore of making the story a bit clearer and more direct, and the life somewhat faster moving. Both Chambers and Smith write well.

Born in North Carolina, admitted to the bar in Tennessee, Benton moved to St. Louis and entered the Senate when his new state was admitted to the Union. Bully Benton came to the Senate with a reputation for learning and for pugnacity—he had engaged in a rough-and-tumble brawl with Jackson and in a more formal duel had killed his man. In time his pugnacity was restricted to verbal combat, but his learning grew, and though it sometimes bored his colleagues and the spectators, it often proved useful—to historians, for instance, as it was exhibited in his *Thirty Years' View*. In his long career he served, first, Missouri and the West; second, his party and its Presidential leaders, Jackson, Van Buren, and Polk (strangely, Benton never sought the Presidency himself); and, finally, the nation, when he thought its future imperiled by the onslaught of abolitionists and nullificationists.

Considering Benton's belligerency, it is natural to make his biography a tale of combat, and this Smith does. Most vivid of the combats through which the hero is conducted is his contest against the abolitionists and nullificationists, whom he saw as twin edges of shears that threatened to sever the nation's unity. Smith makes Southern sectionalsists, like Henry S. Foote and particularly Calhoun, his villains, because he feels Benton's opposition to them cost him his Senate seat, as well as because he sym-
pathizes with Benton’s position in relation to Calhoun. A well-told, exciting narrative tends to oversimplify the situations it portrays, and that may be a fault of this book. So Benton, the protagonist, may appear here too often in a heroic role and too seldom as the pompous and tiresome verbalizer he sometimes seemed to his colleagues. Yet the book is accurate, clear, and concise. If it is overfriendly to Benton, it could hardly be otherwise; Benton was such a fighter that he made men choose sides.

University of Delaware

John A. Munroe

The South in Northern Eyes, 1831 to 1861. By Howard R. Floan. (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1958. x, 198 p. Index. $3.95.)

This work develops in detail a central fact which has long been known to the historical craft—that eminent New Englanders, such as Garrison, Phillips, Whittier, and Lowell, reached their antislavery position without any firsthand experience of the South, and that their picture of slavery was generally distorted and misshapen in its outlines. Mr. Floan further demonstrates that the milder response of New York writers, like Melville, Bryant, and Whitman, to the same conditions which set off such fulminations in Boston was at least partially conditioned by greater familiarity of these men with the Southern scene.

Against such findings few historians, it is to be suspected, would lodge much of an exception. But Mr. Floan’s implications take up where his facts end, and it is here that a wide divergence of views may be expected. If I understand the implications correctly, Mr. Floan believes that the Civil War resulted in large part because the vivid distortions of the ill-informed New England radicals shaped a “sense of cultural difference [which] prepared Northern minds for the grim logic of the battlefield.” He then proceeds to deal quite harshly with these New Englanders for their misrepresentations, seeming to believe that if only the truth of slave conditions had been known in the North, the institution would have aroused less violent hatred, allowing presumably for gradual and peaceful solution of the sectional controversy. Such an assumption rests on the belief that men might have felt far less hostility to a slavery which was not characterized by general cruelty, lust, and sadism, ignoring the vital issues of human dignity and human freedom. Unfortunately, neither history nor individual experience would appear to sanction the thesis that knowledge or even familiarity necessarily reduces tension or removes hostilities.

Approaching the question from the opposite angle, it might also be asked what knowledge of slavery actually was. Of course the abolitionists were propagandists, and of course they exaggerated, but were they indeed ignorant of the substance of Negro bondage? No man enjoying freedom
really needed to know more than the definition of slavery and that it existed in the South to become its bitter antagonist. Perhaps the distortions Mr. Floan so correctly indicates, and which are certainly to be condemned for violence to the truth, had nothing to do with the truth of American Negro slavery.

*Louisiana State University in New Orleans*  

**JOSEPH G. TREGLE, JR.**

*First Blood: The Story of Fort Sumter.* By W. A. SWANBERG. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957. x, 373 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $5.95.)

The centennial anniversary of the Civil War is being heralded by a new abundance of popular literature that bids fair to probe many a dark corner of those turbulent years and uncover many an unsung hero. Let us hope that most of it is as scholarly and as free of bias as W. A. Swanberg's interesting contribution, *First Blood.*

This book has as its protagonist little-known Major Robert Anderson, who commanded Fort Sumter when the opening guns of the war were fired. The author tells us much about this Kentucky-born West Pointer of distinctly Southern heritage and how he discharged his responsibilities as a United States army officer when faced with the risk of starting a civil war. Over and beyond that, however, *First Blood* is almost a day-by-day account of events, north and south, that bore on the fate of the Federally held bastion in Charleston Harbor. Fort Sumter is seen standing as a challenge to disunionism. In that respect Mr. Swanberg's narrative is informingly descriptive of the final, irreconcilable issue between the North and the South.

Faithfully the author recites the fateful events that led to violence at Charleston. Dramatically he interprets their impact on the various individuals at the center of things. It is not a pretty picture of a great moment in history, viewed from either side. But, then, fratricide or the contemplation of it could hardly be otherwise. There could be none of the glory of the Alamo in the fall of Fort Sumter when the enemy was your brother.

The procrastination of the United States government, its indecision on policy, its bungling of relief for the beleaguered garrison, all were caused not so much by the changing administration at Washington as by crosscurrents of disloyalty to the Union in high places. Much of this disloyalty sprang from honest states rightism, but some was the product of political skulduggery and malfeasance that might better be classed as treason for profit. On the Southern side, Mr. Swanberg has painted an equally distressing picture of Charleston hotheads, encouraged by power-hungry politicians in other parts of the South, clamoring for the reduction of Fort Sumter as an affair
of honor. It would appear, too, that they were being abetted to some extent by those in their midst who were willing to risk a bloody civil war to remove the Yankee threat to the commercial supremacy of their port, that is, to halt the diversion of tonnage to rival Savannah.

Of course, Major Anderson was intent on preserving the peace. But one suspects that he never really planned to fight, that he never thought it would be necessary. Some of the preparations and some lack of them make it appear that he was only going through the motions in order to impress the Charlestonians. As a veteran artillery officer he must have known that the fort's top tier would be untenable in case of attack from land. But at great cost of time and labor he ostentatiously mounted his heavy guns there. And after the Southern land batteries actually opened fire it seems that Major Anderson's cannoneers discovered they had precious few cartridge bags ready-made for use with any of their guns.

As it turned out, there was little blood-letting for an event that precipitated the greatest war this land has ever known. Four Southerners were injured and four men were wounded at Sumter by flying brick or pieces of shell, none of them seriously. The only fatality of all the cannonading was a horse killed by a Sumter ball. In fact, Anderson's surrender may well have given the chivalry of the South a false idea about the bloodlessness of war.

First Blood is well executed and objective. Mr. Swanberg has made a significant contribution to Civil War literature.

Philadelphia

NATHANIEL C. HALE

Blockade: The Civil War at Sea. By Robert Carse. (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1958. [viii], 280 p. Illustrations, appendices, bibliography, index. $5.00.)

The naval side of the Civil War is the theme of an increasing number of works, and may develop a bibliography which in time will rival the huge mass of books and articles dealing with the land operations of the war. Mr. Carse has made a worthy addition to the shelves of Civil War students. This volume concerns the running of the Union blockade and the men and ships who were engaged in that hazardous but lucrative phase of the Confederate war effort.

The author's attention is given mainly to operations in and out of the port of Wilmington, North Carolina. Wilmington's tricky approaches through numerous islands and offshore reefs made it the most useful cargo port remaining in Southern hands after the blockade reached its peak of effectiveness. Tons of supplies were unloaded along the Cape Fear River inlets to nourish the faltering Confederate cause.

Mr. Carse does not attempt to tell the whole story of Wilmington. He has singled out a handful of the more successful ship captains and high-
lighted their careers. They fall into two principal categories: Confederate naval officers and privateers on the one hand, and a coterie of mercenary foreign sea dogs on the other. The Southern navigators were all motivated by a fierce patriotism. They gave everything, even their personal funds to the point of bankruptcy, to promote "The Cause." They made quite a contrast to the British, French, and other Europeans who were only concerned with picking up a cargo of cotton to cash in on the high-priced markets waiting in Nassau, Havana, and Europe.

The cold-blooded profit-seeking of these adventurers often led them to run ships with empty holds through the blockade during the last part of the war. Even though the Confederacy was desperate for medicines, textiles, munitions, paper, guns, and a thousand other items and black market prices were fantastic, the effectiveness of the Federal lookout made the over-all financial and personal risk less with lightened ships. Besides, what these men were after was the cotton which they might carry out. Mr. Carse has a fast-moving narrative which presents this emotional story in a very interesting style. The harsh reality of an unfavorable military situation against the backdrop of die-hard patriotism is well illustrated in his descriptions of Southern naval heroes raging against a Richmond government which did not bar its ports to any ship failing to bring in full cargoes of needed items.

There are brief glimpses of other phases of the blockade: scenes aboard the interdicting squadrons, Admiral David Porter's resolute leadership, General Ben Butler's incompetence and headline hunting, the war-boom towns of Havana and Nassau, the sun-baked transfer port of Matamoras in Maximilian's Empire of Mexico, and Fort Fisher and its redoubtable garrison. We also are given a view of the comings and goings of the Confederacy's secret agents, including the noted female operatives Belle Boyd and Rose Greenhow.

The story of Fort Fisher is particularly well told, including the very human love story and family life of the commandant, Colonel William Lamb. This resourceful officer and his heroic men succeeded in holding off Union assault forces and covering the final dashes to safety of the blockade runners long after a vast Federal preponderance of men and material should have reduced them to surrender. Fort Fisher remained a bright page of Southern success long after the Confederate ramparts had collapsed almost everywhere to the south and west of the final Virginia-Carolina salient.

Mr. Carse has worked from sources which include memoirs, diaries, and official records. He has made particularly good use of the private papers and letters of Colonel and Mrs. William Lamb. There are a number of good maps and illustrations, and the six appendices contain brief sketches carrying on the postwar lives and careers of the persons principally highlighted in the book. There is an adequate index and bibliography.

The author has manifestly steeped himself in the historical background of his work. Scholars may take some exception to his ready acceptance of
certain historical theses which are still in controversy. For example, there has been some research tending to show that the depression in the English cotton mills may have been due to the owners finding it more profitable to hold accumulated cotton stocks for speculative profit and to close their mills. Britain had stockpiled cotton before the war, and non-American sources of supply were found after it began. American cotton was, of course, drastically reduced, but by 1864 more non-American cotton was being imported into England than the total brought in from our Southern states during 1860, the last full year of peace.

The "Lost Cause" was nowhere better served than by the men who carried the Stars and Bars to sea. Mr. Carse gives us a vivid look at their moments of triumph, and draws a memorable picture of their slow decline to final, bitter failure. The Civil War enthusiast will find this book rewarding reading.

U.S. Naval War College

LAWRENCE EALY

Owen Wister Out West. His Journals and Letters. Edited by FANNY KEMBLE WISTER. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. xx, 269 p. Illustrations, index. $5.00.)

If Owen Wister Out West served no other purpose, and had no other value, it would at least have renewed an interest in Owen Wister's own Virginian. The Virginian ought to be one of our great books. It is certainly one of America's most significant and influential books. Anything that helps to explain it, illuminate it, place it in proper literary and historical perspective is also significant, and this the collection of journals and letters, so skillfully woven together by Wister's daughter Fanny Wister Stokes, certainly does.

The book itself covers a period from 1885 to 1895 when Wister, a rather blase, rather unhappy young Philadelphia intellectual and clubman, suddenly discovered the West. By diary and letter his first visit to Wyoming is described, as are his later hunting trips there, and further visits as a journalist in search of material for articles and stories to Oregon, Texas, and Arizona. Like his friend and fellow Harvard-man Theodore Roosevelt, the West meant liberation, a reaffirmation of fundamental vigor, and also a lesson in democracy. These attitudes and reactions, these discoveries are all here in this tissue of excerpts, and also Wister's gradually maturing determination to write a book, the book about it all.

The book was written. It was popular as few books have been, it has been influential as few books have been, but this very popularity and influence have tended to obscure the book itself. It has fallen victim to the scorn that literary people tend to have for popularity, and it suffers from the incessant repetition by imitators of all its scenes and attitudes. How often, for instance, have even such minor characters as Uncle Hughy, garrulous,
amorous old-timer, and Mrs. Taylor, stout, tart, good-natured ranchwoman, been dealt out to us, over and over again? The movies have almost sucked *The Virginian* dry. These diaries and letters serve to clear the air, re-emphasize the point that has been lost: Wister was the first; he saw them, he drew them with real honesty, really clear vision. He was not only making a myth, he was recording what he saw to be the truth. If, then, Mrs. Stokes's book merely served the function of revealing, with a certain amount of shock, how close in this case the fiction of *The Virginian* was to the realities of Wyoming in the eighties, it would have its value; though actually merely as background for *The Virginian* it is a bit disappointing. There is not really so very much of Wyoming in it. Mrs. Stokes's own preface gives a few nostalgic notes about Jackson Hole as seen by a girl before the first World War. Owen Wister's description of his own arrival at Medicine Bow predicts the opening scenes of his book. Balaam's cruelty to horses is prefigured in a real incident, long descriptions of hunting trips in and around Jackson Hole show where the experience for that background came from. There is comparatively little, however, about people, and almost no record of the dialogue, speech, psychology of Westerners, those things that are most authentic about *The Virginian* itself.

Nonetheless, with its inclusion of scenes of Nebraska, Arizona, Texas and Oregon, the book, quite apart from any connection with *The Virginian* is a vivid record of the West during its Homeric period. Details stick with one, like those of a miserable snowy journey in the Big Bend country, or hunting for mountain sheep in a Grovont hailstorm. Simply as a record of the West it has fascination. I should think even to one who is not particularly familiar with the country, these snapshots would be evocative.

The book is also rewarding as a portrait of a man and a period—the boredom and dissatisfaction with what one would have thought to be an extremely rich life in the secure and opulent eastern seaboard of those days, with many trips to Europe; the creative stir Wister felt at the opening of a new and different world, and the gradually maturing sense of vocation and of professional skill during just those ten years between 1885 and 1895.

All in all, first as a document of literary history, then as a book-in-itself of travels, and then as a piece of unconscious autobiography, *Owen Wister Out West* is worth reading. There must be a special interest for Philadelphians, too, if perhaps a melancholy one. *The Virginian* remains the most spectacular book written by a Philadelphian since the *Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*, and is, of course, another monument to that curious dissatisfaction with home which so many creative Philadelphians have felt. There is, in a negative sort of way, a great deal of Philadelphia in this book, as there is in *The Virginian*. Wister could not have loved the West so much if he had not been so bored with the East. And yet one does wonder why.

*Princeton, N. J.*

NATHANIEL BURT

Tent Chautauqua, which took to the road in 1904, did not die until 1932 when the movies and the sting of the depression killed it off. Thousands of men and women in their forties, or older, can remember the stir and excitement of Chautauqua week. This book is for them and for a generation too young to have applauded Dunbar’s Handbell Ringers or Bryan or Russell Conwell (whose “Acres of Diamonds” oration founded a university) or Mme. Schumann-Heink or Phil Clark and his Marching Men of Song.

Culture Under Canvas is the product of a fortunate collaboration. The facts, in great and colorful abundance, were supplied by Mr. Harrison, one of the chief begetters of tent Chautauqua. His story has been shaped and given historical context by Mr. Detzer, whose biography of Carl Sandburg evinced a sympathetic understanding of the older rural America which loved and supported tent Chautauqua.

The story begins in Marshalltown, Iowa, on July 1, 1904. Nine days later H. P. Harrison, just out of college, had his baptism of fire at Iowa Falls as platform manager for the Standard Chautauqua Bureau. Keith Vawter’s brilliant idea of taking “Chautauqua” on the road had come to fruition. This momentous beginning had a history behind it stretching back to James Redpath’s Boston Lyceum Bureau, organized in 1868.

Redpath, a Scot who had been a Civil War correspondent, transformed the old haphazard lyceum system, with its main emphasis on uplift, by two new departures. He provided his famous stable of lecturers with expert management as well as handsome fees, and he operated on the principle that “the lyceum lecture is a failure if it succeeds in imparting instruction alone. It should afford pleasure as well.” (Enter Mark Twain and Josh Billings.) The next step was taken when the sober-sided attendants at the Sunday School Assembly at Fair Point on Chautauqua Lake discovered, in 1874, the pleasure of receiving instruction and inspiration in the open air. The decisive turning point came in 1880 when, in place of the usual concert of sacred music, someone dared to play von Weber’s romantic “Invitation to the Dance.”

In 1904, by combining Redpath’s experiments with various kinds of lectures and Chautauqua’s experiments with cultural entertainment in the summertime, Keith Vawter hit on just the right combination for his traveling Chautauqua. The pattern was soon set—speakers, from politicians and reformers to funny men, choruses (Royal Dragoons and Imperial Grenadiers), “entertainers,” and readers. It was several years before Chautauqua risked a full-length play. The break-through was made in 1913 with the Shakespearean performances of the Ben Greet Players. The expected storm of objection did not thunder down. The theater was in. Oddly enough, opera
was already popular on the circuit, though Vawter had begun cautiously by tying a single star to a band or chorus.

Tent Chautauqua is gone forever. Its place has been taken by the canned art of the movies, radio, and television. The loss is considerable. Making heroes of the actors, readers, and singers, the Chautauqua audiences welcomed them back year after year. With a few exceptions, the villages and small cities of America no longer have this sense of community participation in the art of the entertainer. But the greatest loss is the disappearance of a platform for reformers and crusading politicians. The issues of the day were fought out night after night under the brown tent: Bob La Follette hammering at "special privilege," Jacob Riis on political corruption, Senator Norris, Judge Ben Lindsey, muckraker Lincoln Steffens, Samuel Gompers ("Toilers Organized, What are their Aims?")—all men who would be too "controversial" for TV to let loose on the present underprivileged public.

Keith Vawter and his young platform manager H. P. Harrison, who grew up in the business, knew, down to the last chorus and entertainer's innuendo, what Chautauqua audiences wanted and would "take." Harrison's story, pointed up by Detzer, is an important index to the cultural tolerance and aspirations of a vanished America.

Princeton University

Willard Thorp


Students of labor will, obviously, be the ones most interested in Father Cornell's dissertation on the anthracite strike of 1902, but there are also substantial amounts of grist for the mills of specialists in public opinion and in government history. The role of public opinion is carefully studied and charted during the long strike. Editorials from ninety-nine newspapers in Pennsylvania, the East, and the rest of the United States are cited to show that public sympathy was, for the most part, on the side of the miners and that this public support contributed to the successful outcome of the strike. Moreover, the papers of Theodore Roosevelt and of several of his colleagues—including P. C. Knox and Elihu Root—are used to throw new light on the unprecedented intervention by the President during this crisis.

The main story, however, belongs to John Mitchell. His activities and ideas are clearly revealed by copious quotation from his correspondence. The conduct of the 1902 strike—as well as the preliminary 1900 struggle—may be witnessed over the shoulder of this shrewd president of the United Mine Workers as he manipulates public opinion, tries to restrain the radical elements within this newly organized segment of his union, and tests his
monopoly of labor against the oligarchy of railroad companies, which, in fact, controlled the anthracite industry. When compared with his opponents, the old-style industrial leaders who placed profit and property rights before human rights, John Mitchell appears in this study as a union statesman whose moderate views and conservative demands did much to further the cause of organized labor.

This image of John Mitchell, while not without validity, so dominates the author that the unchallenged opinions and statements of the United Mine Workers leader are accepted as the truth. Since much of the correspondence quoted was written in the heat of battle, since John Mitchell was opposed to "giving aid and comfort to one's opponents" (p. 150, note), and since there is at least one instance in which he distorted the truth of a situation (pp. 67-68), an analysis of the operators' position and arguments might have created an independent, less partisan point of view. The letters of George F. Baer, who was the author of the famous "divine right" letter and president of the Reading Company, have been studied, but apparently they contain little of value because they are quoted only twice and then concerning a minor issue. The author, however, does not comment explicitly on what would seem to be a rich source for the coal operators' side of the story.

Father Cornell's preoccupation with the battle for public opinion tends to obscure the complex reality of the strike which lay behind the newspaper accounts. The whole problem of the extent of violence during the strike is debated in chapter six without being resolved. The author argues that accounts of violence were magnified by the hostile segment of the press, but, in placing the blame for much of the violence on the operators' police force, he asserts in a paraphrase that the 1902 strike "developed into one of the most violent collisions between capital and labor Pennsylvania had ever witnessed" (p. 162). The introduction of the State Guard to maintain order and to protect private property is criticized as unnecessary and as an unsuccessful attempt to force the workers back to the mines. Perhaps Father Cornell would not have underrated the potential danger of race riots if he had been aware of the 1897 Lattimer riots, in which seventeen immigrant workers were killed in Luzerne County by a sheriff's posse. This incident and the resulting trial, which drew national and international attention to conditions in the anthracite region, inflamed labor relations for years.

Despite certain omissions and some partisanship, Father Cornell's dissertation is especially rewarding when it traces the complex negotiations before and during the strike, and when it reveals the motivations of the main participants from their private papers. The prodigious amount of research which went into this account of the 1902 anthracite strike is indicated in a useful bibliography.

*Wyoming Historical and Geological Society*  
*Richard D. Williams*

Many of the historical societies representing the interests of religious or minority groups were founded to help make known their contributions to American life. Each of these has had in common the emphasis of its particular role, a role which was either neglected or distorted by the old school historian whose failures and omissions were countered with a filiopietistic vigor that has for some time characterized the defensive spirit of minority groups.

Newly trained historians, reappreciating the past, have in recent decades stepped beyond the exclusive domain which has held the English Europeans aloft in American history. Their scholarship has been objective, presented with depth, and stripped of the self-importance which the first generation of minority group historians, eager to find a place in the pages of American history, arrogated unto themselves. This new perspective continues to grow as the immigrant past recedes and is remembered only by the records that have survived.

To help achieve a program of its own and to raise the existing standards of history, the American Jewish Historical Society sponsored a conference on the Writing of American Jewish History, held at Peekskill, New York, in the fall of 1954. The present volume of proceedings, an outgrowth of the conference, is a forward step, a step from the sporadic to the scientific. Four general fields, each carefully subdivided into local and regional history, economic history, immigration and biography, comprised the two days of discussion.

Opening the session on local and regional history, Sylvester K. Stevens (Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission) significantly noted the difficulty he encountered in obtaining reliable studies of Jews to be incorporated in a Pennsylvania text. He stressed the need for good local history, especially works dealing with ethnic and religious groups, works that could be used by the general historian. The specific application of local history, as outlined by Stevens, was expressed in the preliminary study of Buffalo Jewry delivered by Selig Adler (University of Buffalo). Adler’s excellent résumé of the history of the Jews in Buffalo is an organic presentation of what American local history can be.

The full significance of the various papers begins to emerge in the discussions of labor and economic history. Any study of the Jewish labor movement would be inconceivable without examining its relationship to the general labor movement. Selig Perlman (University of Wisconsin) does exactly this in his paper, “America and the Jewish Labor Movement: A Case of Mutual Illumination.” Similarly, in another session, Robert Ernst (Adelphi College) in “Concepts of Americanism as Reflected in Minority Groups” grasps the interrelationship between American minorities, inter-
interpreting one with the object of illuminating the other. It is the depth of presentation and the use of collateral bodies of knowledge that give both of these studies value and meaning.

At times it becomes difficult to connect the individual sessions to the whole of the conference. There is a wall which sets apart the papers on labor history from those on economic history when the two subjects, because of their structural relationship, should be drawn together. Similarly, the other individual sessions, important in themselves, do not blend with the entire conference. The absence of an all-embracing historian who could have related the various sessions and the wealth of material in each of them to the totality of American Jewish history merely reflects on the newness of the experiment.

Problems of technique, method, and linguistics received special emphasis. While a number of these problems are matters familiar to any trained historian, the barriers presented by source materials in foreign languages remain unsolved. There is no doubt that a knowledge of Yiddish, Hebrew, and German is as requisite to the American Jewish historian as is English itself. But linguistic handicaps are a part of the greater problem that confronts the general historian in our monolingual society. In other areas, such as religious history, some tasty crumbs were present, but the whole rich loaf remained hidden in the cupboard.

Despite these weaknesses, the papers and the discussion are of value, and this pioneer conference can direct others in filling the existing gaps in the study of American civilization. Dr. Moshe Davis and Rabbi Isidore S. Meyer performed a creditable piece of work in preparing these proceedings for the press.

Elkins Park

MAXWELL WHITEMAN

Guide to Naval History Sources

The U. S. Navy Department has announced plans to collect and publish the much scattered documents relating to the naval and maritime history of the American Revolution. Mr. William Bell Clark will edit the work. The Navy Department states that a major contribution to the success of the project can be made by anyone possessing or knowing of unpublished letters, diaries, reports, ships’ logs, and other Revolutionary War documents for the years 1775-1785, and who will make such material or information available to the Director of Naval History, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C. Material submitted will be on loan and will, of course, be returned.