BOOK REVIEWS

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The publication of the papers of great men presents somewhat of a review problem, particularly when such papers are to appear in many volumes over a period of years. We have chosen to review the first volume of each series we select, and to note succeeding volumes as they are published. In addition to these notices, it is our hope that periodic summary reviews of groups of volumes will provide a more general evaluation. Our first review of this nature, Mrs. Walter Muir Whitehill’s appraisal of the first six volumes of the Jefferson Papers, appears in this issue; her review of the next nine published volumes will appear in April.]


After Congress had authorized a new edition of the writings of Thomas Jefferson in 1943, the project was sponsored by Princeton University and aided by a subvention of $200,000 from the New York Times Company. The editor, Mr. Julian P. Boyd, and his staff proposed to present the writings and the recorded actions of Jefferson as accurately and as completely as possible. With this purpose they set out to procure from all quarters of the world photocopies of every available letter by or to Thomas Jefferson; also, masses of legislative, diplomatic, and executive documents, whether written by him or of intrinsic importance in relation to him, and his vastly varied writings on legal, architectural, scientific and many other subjects. These materials having been gathered over a period of years, and systems of filing and controlling them having been invented, tried, and revised, editorial policies had next to be settled.

Planned from the first were at least fifty volumes, divided into a long chronological series, a shorter topographical series, and a supplementary biographical register. The first volume of the edition appeared in 1950, the fifteenth in 1958. Gratitude to the editors for their accuracy and clarity in presenting this mammoth accumulation of material must be accompanied by admiration for the cunning choice among many type sizes made by the Princeton University Press’s inspired typographer, Mr. P. J. Conkwright, and for the thoughtfully selected illustrations reproduced as the Meriden Gravure Company excels in doing.

The first six volumes cover the period from Jefferson’s birth on April 13 (N. S.), 1743, through March 1, 1784. They include his youth and beginnings in Virginia as a student and practitioner of law, his attendance as
a delegate at the Continental Congress, his drafting of the Declaration of Independence, his work as a legislator drafting for the Virginia Assembly, among much else, bills on religious freedom and for the diffusion of knowledge, his debatable administration as war governor of an invaded state, his retirement from that office, his appointment as a peace commissioner, his revision of the Virginia Constitution, and his further service as a delegate to the Continental Congress.

Each Jefferson letter is followed by an abbreviated note giving the physical description of the document and a record of all known versions. Many letters are also followed by an explanatory note having the key words of the topics discussed conveniently printed in small capitals, and by a textual note giving deletions, corrections, and variations between drafts. Highly important documents are preceded by a lengthy editorial note.

The notes following the correspondence illuminate the text by bringing to bear a tremendously wide learning composed of pertinent facts resourcefully chosen and succinctly expressed. Nevertheless, obstacles remain. While Jefferson may well be the fittest subject for a treatment aiming to tell all, to admit that the method presents inherent difficulties is merely to admit that life itself presents them. For example, if to Jefferson’s industry as a writer one adds the variety of his thoughts and activities, and combine with this the laggard state of communications, it is not surprising to find that hundreds of pages may sometimes intervene between one letter and its reply. This reviewer regrets the considered decision to reserve publication of the index to the conclusion of the enterprise, but has found the temporary indices of persons so helpful as to start a hope that a temporary index of subjects might also be added. The substitution in Volume 13 of an alphabetical for a chronological order in the table of contents is a wonderworking improvement, and the running heads giving dates are excellent guideposts. While the short chronology at the beginning of each volume helped, in the absence of the complete chronology and itinerary promised for the far future, Mr. Malone’s beautifully balanced biography afforded the guilty relief of a trot.¹

Occasionally, a reader may find himself at odds with the editor over the allocation of materials. For instance, to this reviewer it appeared that some of the fifty-five pages of editorial comment on the Pennsylvania Territorial Dispute, in the body of the text of Volume 6, might better have been relegated to an appendix. Indeed, throughout the work the reader is continually challenged to decide on the relative proportions for himself—an endeavor in which the length or frequency of correspondence from a given person or on a given subject is no sure guide. Reading these volumes is like viewing a series of enormous tapestries. Parts of the fabric may be frayed or torn away, and parts have faded, so that the heroic figures may be dim and

¹ Dumas Malone, *Jefferson the Virginian* (Boston, 1948), and *Jefferson and the Rights of Man* (Boston, 1951).
hard to trace, but here and there a minor scene will stand out and one has life caught in the act. As much as is revealed of Washington proves clear, consistent, and altogether praiseworthy; one also learns such recondite details as that in April, 1781, it took the express rider Andrew Woodrow thirteen days to ride from Hampshire to Richmond and back, a round trip of four hundred and forty miles for which he billed the state of Virginia six hundred and sixty pounds. The fundamental, the inescapable, difficulty is that after the editor, by the use of typographical distinctions and editorial comments that seem frequently inspired, has done valiantly all that can be done to help, the reader may still suffer spells of bewilderment.

These volumes are scarcely needed to increase the stature of Jefferson—that is apparent from the most cursory acquaintance with his writings. Nor do they trace the development of a genius that would seem to have matured soon and evenly. Still less do they explain the phenomenon of his being as he was. What they do accomplish is to confirm a thousandfold the reader's initial wonder over an intelligence so accurate, so flexible and far-reaching. The letters from even the most distinguished of his contemporaries do but show the length of Jefferson's shadow. In Volume 6 we see his thought outstripping that of George Mason who wrote of the "factious illegal and dangerous Schemes now in contemplation in Congress for dismembering the Commonwealth of Virginia, and erecting a State or States, to the westward of the Alleghany Mountains" (p. 120), and we can measure his distance ahead of Madison who believed that Virginia "ought to presume that the present Union will but little survive the present war" (pp. 131-132).

Around the central figure in these pages sweep the tides of war, bearing a heap of treasures to the beachcombing scholar. Volume 2 by itself should keep a legal historian long and happily occupied; the military expert likewise is enabled by the work to increase and re-evaluate his store, and here for the taking, in Volumes 2 through 6, is perhaps the richest salvage of all—materials for a substantial study of military supply problems during the Revolution. Rarely since, can any committee of Congress have set down so movingly a tale of bare anguish as that which on May 25, 1780, reported to Jefferson concerning the needs of Washington's army.

To these volumes, considered as a whole, the most telling testimonial is the fact that the emerging Jefferson Papers have been accompanied by the prospect of new editions, projected or begun, of Calhoun, Clay, Franklin, Hamilton and Madison writings. The very least that may be inferred is a general agreement among historians that in carrying out their announced aim "that the book would never need to be done again" the Jefferson editors have pushed a becoming modesty close to absurdity. Clearly, what other scholars perceive is not alone the quality and extent of the materials—that stagger the mind—and not merely the exactness of each editorial device (some of which have been well known previously), but the nicety of

2 Volume 5, p. 515.
3 Volume 3, pp. 392-393.
their combination in uses unthought of before. The ordering of this assem-
blage is its glory.

In our expanding universe our quest is for relationships. Past historians
and biographers may be likened to the earlier great archaeologists, such as
Schliemann, who undertook mass excavation in search of individual objects.
An eminent living archaeologist has drawn attention to Thomas Jefferson
as "the first scientific digger," the first person on record to have employed,
a full century ahead of its general acceptance, the now universally recog-

nized principle of archaeological stratification. Jefferson used the principle
(though not the term) in his account of digging into a burial mound situated
on "the low ground of the Rivanna, about two miles above its principal
fork" in 1784, an episode that he described in the Notes on the State of
Virginia. By this same Jeffersonian principle, archaeologists have recently
laid bare not only potsherds, but whole new areas of civilization and have
established new chronologies. Essentially, they are concerned with
relationships.

The Papers of Thomas Jefferson exemplify a concept of history of com-
parable grandeur. By the orderly amassing of numberless records, the edi-
tors have uncovered for later scholars not only the minutiae of one man's
life, but the strata composing areas of history. At first with unwilling belief,
then with awe, the reader sees in the work detailed pieces, cherished during
years of unimaginably patient labor, at last fitted together into a magnifi-
cent construction for a great end. Historical editors who aim at compre-
hensiveness must forever afterward bear in mind the achievement of this
edition of the Jefferson Papers. With it, inclusiveness and clarity have
taken on new meaning. Before future historians has been set a monument
that they can neither belittle nor dislodge. It stands.

North Andover, Mass.

JANE WHITEHILL


Samuel Vetch was born in Scotland in 1668, the son of a famous and especially stubborn dissenting clergyman who became an exile in Holland late in the reign of Charles II. The son soon joined the father in exile and did not return to Britain until the Revolution of 1688, when he came as a volunteer in the forces of William of Orange. Thereafter, he won a commission in a Scottish regiment and campaigned on the Continent until the end of the Anglo-French war in 1697. Home from the wars, he entered into the service of the recently organized Company of Scotland, participated in its

first ill-fated expedition to Darien, and was among the survivors of the Scottish colony who reached New York in desperate straits early in August, 1699.

After assisting his fellow countrymen in their purpose to return to Darien, Vetch elected to seek his own fortune in New York. He made an extraordinarily good beginning in 1700 by marrying the daughter of Robert Livingston, who was related by marriage to Vetch's family. Aided by his wife's relatives and by other Scotsmen in New York and New England, he was quickly launched on a promising career. Ventures into an illicit trade with the French at Quebec and other points gave him a first-hand acquaintance with French North America that he turned to good account at the time of the War of the Spanish Succession. He took the lead in proposing a broad plan for the expulsion of the French, participated in the successful attack on Acadia in 1710, received appointment as the first governor of Nova Scotia, and led the New England forces in the abortive expedition against Quebec in 1711. Soon thereafter, his personal fortunes took a downward trend. He lost the governorship in 1712 to his former associate and friend, Francis Nicholson, and in 1714 he went to England to defend himself against charges of maladministration. Although he was successful in winning reappointment to the governorship, it was only to lose the post again. After eighteen frustrating years, during which he never returned to America, he died in an English debtor's prison in 1732.

Despite the author's obvious care and industry, Vetch remains a very shadowy figure. The study lends additional emphasis to the advantage enjoyed by an immigrant in colonial America who had some useful family connection, a formal education, a fortunate marriage, and, at this particular time, military experience. But the reader is left with no clear impression of the man himself, of the extent of his business activity, of the lands he may have owned, and of the full causes for his declining fortunes in later life. At times, one is left to wonder even as to his place of residence.

Perhaps Mr. Waller would have been well advised to drop his plan for a biographical study. His work has value chiefly for the fuller light it throws upon an especially significant chapter in the Anglo-French contest for the possession of North America, and more particularly for its illumination of the fumbling way in which British policy and action took shape. In this development Vetch played a central part, and the record of his activity is fortunately full enough to permit the author to make a helpful contribution to our understanding of the "Old Empire" in an early and formative stage. It should be added that the author is well aware of the limitations imposed upon his study by the absence of a full record, and that he rightly has built the theme of the book around the vision of empire through which for a brief interval Samuel Vetch laid claim to a place in history. But as biography the book is disappointing.

Princeton University  Wesley Frank Craven

This valuable study fills a need that scholars have long felt for a sound and readable digest of the vast accumulations (thanks to Edmund B. O'Callaghan, Lawrence H. Leder—whose edition of The Livingston Indian Records is here for the first time fully made use of—and other editors) of printed source materials on Indian affairs in colonial New York. To extract the essence of these documents was a courageous undertaking. We are indebted to Dr. Trelease for his success. Not only has he provided a coherent narrative of events during a time of great confusion in Indian relations, but also, by his pithy analysis of many of the issues involved, he has thrown light on similar problems all over the continent.

The first part of the book covers the period of Dutch occupation, and is concerned chiefly with the Algonquian tribes (Delawares, Mahicans, and bands of more or less indeterminate affiliation) in the Hudson Valley and on Long Island. The second part covers the period of English rule, and is largely concerned with the Iroquois Confederacy. The book comes to a climax with the Montreal Treaty of 1701, by which the Iroquois consolidated their position as holding the balance of power between the English and French in America.

In handling such questions as the causes (ultimate and proximate) of friction between Indians and white men, the extent (not very great, according to Dr. Trelease) to which white men in New York province sold Indians as slaves, and the differing conceptions of land ownership entertained by Indians and white men, the author is dispassionate, explicit, and discriminating. He is less successful in discussing Indian religion and its effect on Indian affairs. He appears to accept without challenge the naive dictum of Domine Jonas Michaëlîus, first clerical representative of the Dutch Reformed in America, that the Indians were “devilish men, who serve nobody but the Devil.”

The introductory chapter, in which the author lays a foundation for what follows by discussing the ethos and the complicated tribal divisions of the Indians in the area under review, is useful if read cautiously, but it is not the best part of the book. Such statements as “The Munsee did not exist as such until about 1694, when a group of Shawnee combined with remnants of local bands on the upper Delaware under that name,” will not bear examination. The Shawnees who settled on the upper Delaware in that year, on invitation from the Indians whose center was at Minisink a few miles above, remained distinct from their “Minisink” sponsors. “Minsi,” “Munsee,” “Minassin” are different renderings of the same word, of which “Minisink” is the locative form.

If the book has a central theme, it is, as expressed in the author's preface, that the two cultures confronting each other in America were “incom-
compatible” and that the weaker had to succumb. The alternatives were, according to Dr. Trelease, the expulsion of the Europeans or the extinction of “Indian civilization.” “Kinder treatment and more understanding on the part of the settler,” he writes, “would have eliminated part of the friction and eased the consciences of later generations, but would hardly have eliminated the alternatives.”

The author’s style, like his thought, is clear-cut and forceful. In this instance, however, we may ask ourselves whether he has not oversimplified the problem. Were the alternatives so stark: thine or mine? The Moravians of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania did not think so. They attempted another solution of the race problem: co-operation. But for the accident of a war which in its inception did not concern Indian affairs, they might have succeeded. United States commissioners at Pittsburgh in 1778, impressed with the Moravian work among the Indians, proposed the creation of a fourteenth Indian state. But the American people at large were not ready. The sense of urgency for such a solution was then lacking. Today we are confronted again with alternatives. The human race must either find a means of accommodating “incompatible” cultures, or cease to exist.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

PAUL A. W. WALLACE


In writing a general history of American lotteries, Mr. Ezell explains that the task “has been unusually difficult because of the absence of preliminary spadework by other writers,” an absence not quite so pronounced as he indicates. Curiously, as he says, scholars and textbooks have ignored the subject. His bibliographical essay, covering more than thirteen pages, testifies to his laborious research.

Just as the greatest baseball heroes have all made occasional errors, so it is too much to expect, in pioneering work of this sort, that even the most meticulous historians should escape every pitfall. This being so, it would indeed be pedantic to pounce upon an occasional slip and inflate it. However, it is not here a matter of an occasional slip; the book is so loaded with them as to destroy in large measure its reliability if not its usefulness.

This is a serious charge. But, to paraphrase the words of Governor Bradford, as distasteful as it is to mention these slips, the truth of history requires it. Competent descriptive reviews of the book have appeared and many others will follow, easily available to anyone. Within the space permitted, and with the flat statement that they are typical of a host of others, it is incumbent upon me without more ado to point out some of these errors.
The author cites certain “lotteries held in 1749, 1750, and 1761,” among the total number for the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University. The first two were the same lottery. Of the second lottery for the college, that of 1753–1754, he says it appears that “this undertaking was never completed.” Not only was it completed, with the prize list published, but the best evidence indicates that it raised a good part of the cost of erecting Nassau Hall. The fourth lottery for the college was first drawn in May, 1764, not in January. The fifth and last, this one to benefit certain churches in addition to the college, drawn in 1774, Mr. Ezell lists in a table of colonial lotteries as being authorized by Delaware with the amount to be raised unknown. It was not authorized, and the amount to be raised was $15,000.

In the same table, Mr. Ezell lists eight lotteries authorized by colonial New Hampshire. Six of the bills representing the eight were not signed by the governor and hence did not create lotteries. Colonial New Hampshire authorized only two.

Mr. Ezell characterizes the first authorized New York provincial lottery, created by an act passed in 1745/46, as a “discouraging experiment.” At the time, so it was announced, it gave “general Satisfaction.” Referring to the drawing of the next New York lottery, the author says it “was probably not held.” But it was drawn June 1–25, 1747. Then he describes these two along with the third as “repeated failures.” As a matter of fact, the second and third each turned out to be a brilliant financial success.

The “United States Lottery” is the most important ever run in the country. Mr. Ezell gives the sum to be raised by means of the deduction from the prizes as $1,005,000. It was $1,500,000. He states that the prizes in “each” of the four classes “ran from $20 to $50,000,” but the highest in Class 1 was $10,000 and the lowest in Class 4 was $50. He says there were 42,317 prizes in Class 1. The number is 20,433. He says “the ‘State Lottery’ was drawn in York, Pennsylvania, in 1778, but no official record of such a lottery exists.” To the contrary, the drawing, under the abbreviated title used by a local resident, was that of Class 1 of the United States Lottery.

Writing of colonial lotteries in Delaware, Mr. Ezell states that in 1772 “William Alexander, Lord Sterling, disposed of his New York and New Jersey lands by a raffle. The same year George Washington recorded purchasing tickets in a ‘Delaware lottery.’ ” The two lotteries cited here are one and the same—the “Delaware Lottery.” It had positively no connection with colonial Delaware, but was so named because it was planned to hold the drawing on an island in the Delaware River between Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Stirling, and this is the correct spelling, did not dispose of any of his property by the lottery because after the drawing was held, he canceled it and returned the ticket money. It should be mentioned, too, that the author’s frequent use of the term “raffle,” except for a special type of tiny lottery, is anomalous and historically incorrect. A raffle is to a lottery what a pebble is to a rock.
Mr. Ezell correctly cites the authorization for a huge Delaware lottery in 1859. But the legislature contracted with Richard France, not “French,” as he has it; $720,000 was to be raised, not $750,000; among the beneficiaries were five railroads, not four; and France defaulted on the fifth semi-annual payment, not the first.

We are told that in 1790 Connecticut approved £200 to be raised by lottery “for the town of Greenwich, but without specifying the use to which the money would be put.” As a matter of fact, Connecticut granted the lottery in 1787; the avails were for the First (ecclesiastical) Society in Greenwich; and the specific purpose was to procure a parsonage. In the same paragraph, it is stated that Pennsylvania legalized the “Aaronsburg Town Lottery” of 1795 without giving either the amount or the purpose. This was the “Aaronsburgh Lottery”; Pennsylvania did not legalize it; it was drawn in 1786; and its purpose is well known.

It would require many pages to complete the list of errors. Among them, the wrong lottery is named as the one in which General Nathanael Greene bought sixteen tickets. Vermont authorized forty-two lotteries, not twenty-four. The man who dreamed the lucky ticket number in the New York swindling scandal of 1818 was Naphtali Judah, not (Thomas W.) Thorne. Most emphatically, it is not true that Daniel M’Intyre, in a letter of November 17, 1845, while a partner in a lottery firm, “frankly admitted bribing members” of the Pennsylvania legislature. The name is Peckham, not “Pechan”; Perkiomen, not “Perkinomen”; Bood, not “Blood”; Defoe, not “De Fore”; Mispillion, not “Mispillon”; Stevens, not “Stevins”; Murray (Earl of Dunmore), not “Murry”; and there are many more.

But just as serious are the omissions. For example, there is not a word I can find concerning many of the most important lotteries ever run in the country, including those for historic Christ Church in Philadelphia, the presently named First and Brick Presbyterian churches in New York, the old Cape Henlopen Lighthouse that fell into the sea in 1926, and the great majority of the loyalist lotteries.

Great emphasis is placed upon material in the acts authorizing lotteries, but only seldom are they identified by their historic names. Even less than a thumbnail sketch of a man should give his full name, not merely the date and place of birth. Rarely are the beneficiaries identified by today’s names. Thus, a lottery to erect a yellow fever hospital in New York is cited, but the building is not identified as an early home of the renowned Bellevue Hospital. A lottery for a “common hall” in Philadelphia is noted, but the building is not identified as in the present Independence Hall group. The frequent use of the term “billet” is anomalous and jarring—historically, the word was rarely used and only then as a special type of ticket, and it was never adopted by the public. Conversion tables of the diverse colonial pounds in relation to the Spanish milled dollar, the common denominator, would have been helpful. The bibliography contains much deadwood—secondary sources either erroneous or redundant.
While I am sure from portions of the book that the author is capable of an immensely superior job, I cannot understand how the statement could be made on the dust jacket that the book is a definitive study. Is it conclusive and final? I fear that a whole new crop of historical errors are about to become perennial.

Ambler


There is nothing out of the ordinary about the title which Mr. Knollenberg has selected for his book on the causes of the American Revolution, but the contents and the manner of presentation are unusual. His thesis is succinctly phrased in the introduction where he states that "while the British Stamp Act of 1765 greatly contributed to and touched off the colonial uprising of 1765-1766, the colonists had been brought to the brink of rebellion by a number of other provocative British measures from 1759 to 1764." He contends that these basic issues persisted after the Stamp Act was repealed in 1766 and contributed to the mounting colonial discontent which culminated in the American Revolution of 1775-1783. He maintains that it is reasonable to believe that had Newcastle remained in office after 1762, "the provocative colonial measures from 1763 to 1765 . . . would not have been taken."

Mr. Knollenberg examines in detail the various controversies which aroused either individual colonies or particular sections of the country in the period under consideration. Specifically, he directs the reader's attention to the Two Penny Act in Virginia, to the issuance of general writs of assistance in Massachusetts, and to the prohibition of judicial and other commissions not revocable at the king's pleasure which was an issue in New York. In other chapters he discusses British politics and the new British policy, the Proclamation of 1763 and its effect on expansionist plans, General Amherst's Indian policy and the ensuing uprising of Pontiac, and the attempts to enforce the Sugar Act of 1764. Readers may be surprised to find an entire chapter devoted to the activities of Thomas Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury, and another concerned with the enforcement of the White Pines Acts. Almost half the chapters are devoted to the various measures of the Grenville program and to the colonial protests against them.

Several of Mr. Knollenberg's interpretations are certain to be questioned by colonial historians. Insofar as he dismisses the various parliamentary restrictions prior to 1759, he refutes the view of C. M. Andrews and many others. It would seem that he also minimizes the significance of the Stamp Act crisis, which recently has been brought into prominence by E. S.
Morgan. The recent article by Page Smith in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (January, 1960) on the causes of the American Revolution offers interesting contrasts when compared with Mr. Knollenberg’s volume.

Certainly the length to which the author has gone to provide the reader with reference tools is noteworthy. Of the 486 pages in the book, 233 are used for appendices, footnotes, bibliography, and an index. Some forty-nine pages are required to list the bibliography. Although the footnotes are placed after the appendices, they, too, are as complete as anyone could desire. Mr. Knollenberg has used contemporary letters widely, and his terse and pithy writing enhances the value of the book. For example, one chapter contains a concise summary of the various restrictions on colonial trade and manufacturing from 1660 to 1764 in seven pages. He refers in the appropriate chapters to the particular interpretations of Peckham, Dickerson, and others, and then substantiates or disagrees with them. The book is well edited and free of glaring errors. Although he states that John Dickinson’s “Farmer’s Letters” were published in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, which they were, the first letter was printed in the *Pennsylvania Chronicle* a day prior to its publication in the *Gazette*. Mr. Knollenberg’s interpretations merit consideration along with such other volumes on the American Revolution as those by Gipson, Miller, Dickerson, and the Morgans.

*Kansas State Teachers College*  
*Emporia, Kansas*  

**JOHN J. ZIMMERMAN**


After General Washington took command of the Continental Army besieging Boston in the summer of 1775, he set about making the position of the British there as difficult as possible. One means which he adopted was to harass and interdict commerce moving to and from Boston in Massachusetts Bay. This had the double virtue of reducing the flow of supplies and munitions to the British and of obtaining needed goods for the Continental Army. Acting in the name of the Continental Congress, Washington chartered eight small coasting vessels, seven schooners, and a brig. They were armed in whatever manner their owners or the Continental agents could manage, and were manned largely by officers and men from the army. Between August, 1775, and October, 1777, they captured fifty-five vessels. Some of the prizes carried arms, ammunition, and uniforms, and four were transports with troops aboard. In September, 1776, Washington turned the direction of the vessels over to the Marine Committee of the Congress. They were never integrated with the Continental Navy which
had been established, and the last of "Washington's Navy" went out of service in October, 1777.

The part played in the naval history of the Revolution by "Washington's Navy" has hitherto received slight and inadequate attention. Although the vessels involved were few and small, they played a not inconsiderable role in the opening phase of the War of Independence. Washington's concept of the employment of the vessels was not very imaginative and does not entitle him to be rated a naval genius. He did, however, envisage a sensible use of maritime force which took advantage of ships and men available, and succeeded in making them serve his ends well.

William Bell Clark, the author of this study, is the outstanding historian of the naval side of the Revolution of our time or of any day down to our own. This is his sixth book on the field. He is at present in charge of collecting and editing the documents dealing with the naval history of the Revolution, a program which is being carried out by the Navy Department.

For this book, Mr. Clark has collected and sifted his materials with care and patience. He has used manuscript collections in Britain and the United States, and has also worked through the published sources which bear on the subject. It is clear from a reading of the text, together with the comments on sources and the notes, that the author is a master of his materials and that he has used them judiciously and well. His thorough familiarity with naval history and things nautical has enabled him to interpret wisely and to put down his interpretations clearly. There are no efforts at dramatic effects, but the narrative moves forward at a good pace and is never dull. When Mr. Clark draws an inference he tells his reader so, and one feels that he is being given the full story insofar as the surviving sources make this possible.

The book is organized along chronological lines, but Mr. Clark has not only given attention to operations of vessels, but also to chartering, outfitting, manning, the administration carried out through Washington's aides and the agents appointed to act for them, the problems of disposing of prizes and their cargoes, and the payment of prize money to officers and men. The result is a remarkably well-rounded and tidy account of a significant phase of the American Revolution.

Pomona College

John Haskell Kemble

The Vice-Admiralty Courts and the American Revolution. By Carl Ubbelohde. (Chapel Hill, N. C.: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1960. xii, 242 p. Bibliography, index. $6.00.)

Considering the scarcity of records and the incompleteness of those still existing, Professor Ubbelohde has achieved a remarkable success in
resurrecting the dead bones of the colonial vice-admiralty courts, reconstructing the skeletons and breathing some life into them. His bibliography proves it was no easy task, and the length to which he explored archives and libraries indicates that his opus represents years of research. Footnotes there are, and in profusion, but they do not smack of pedantry, rather of a scholarly effort to make as comprehensive a study as the limited material discoverable would permit. In doing so, he has also made it readable, and not too confusing.

With vice-admiralty courts in each province and four regional vice-admiralty courts competing with them, it is a tribute to the author's skill that one is not bewildered by the complexities. It is quite apparent, as the account develops, that not only jurisdictions and decisions of the courts, but the recipients of royal or ministerial favor who manned them provided one of the irritants, although a minor one, that brought on the American Revolution. On one point I disagree with Professor Ubbelohde, and that is an inconsequential one, which I cite to keep the record straight. "Spurned by the Congressional recommendations," the author writes, "Pennsylvania established a court in 1778." Actually, Pennsylvania created an admiralty court by act of Assembly, March 26, 1776, one of the earliest to follow the recommendations of the Continental Congress, and its first case, "John Barry qui tam v Sloop Edward," was tried in April of that year.

The little volume also bears the imprint and seal of the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, and its publication was assisted by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc. They, along with the University of North Carolina Press, have presented Professor Ubbelohde's text in an attractive format.

Brevard, N. C.

William Bell Clark


It is as difficult, and as unfair, to compare American eighteenth-century satire with the poetry of Pope or the prose of Swift as to compare the academic achievements of Cambridge, Massachusetts, with those of Cambridge, England, at the same period. The American political writer was a provincial and an amateur, not a practitioner in a sophisticated metropolis where the clever pen received subsidy in the form of a government post or a nobleman's favor, to say nothing of the profits of successful publication. Mr. Granger has set his study within the technical framework of satire as the literary critic defines and appraises it. Alas, with very few exceptions, it must be admitted that the satire of the American Revolution, interesting
as it is as commentary on historical events, is poor in literary quality almost to the point of being satire on satire.

Schematically, Mr. Granger’s book treats in separate chapters of the various objects or causes of the satires: the Stamp Act, tea and the war, the British government, the American Congress, the two armies, patriots, trimmers, traitors and loyalists. The examples given are knit by historical narrative and commentary. The sequence of events is clear and the examples well chosen and skillfully placed in their background.

As might be expected, the wit of Franklin and the better than average talents of Freneau and Hopkinson rise above the tedious level of the corpus of American satire. Jingles and doggerel flowed freely in the newspapers and magazines, on broadsheets and in pamphlets. Editors and publishers were inclined quite undiscriminatingly to print anything submitted to them, and scurrility was not barred. The surviving record is more the account of popular, folk expression than the annals of formal literary history.

The author might have mentioned, if but briefly, the pictorial satire, the cartoons, which appeared in quantity during the period he covered. One such, Franklin’s Stamp Act cartoon, was republished in America with explanatory text. Others contained symbolism used frequently in the written satires.

As the librarian of a rare book library which contains the original printings of a great many of the satires which Mr. Granger used, I am somewhat concerned by what seems to me the too frequent citation of texts from secondary sources where the originals could have been consulted with comparative ease. Had he consulted the manuscript in the Library Company, Mr. Granger would not have fallen into the error of using Freneau’s revised text of General Gage’s Soliloquy (pp. 169–170) as it appeared in the 1786 collected edition. No copy of the contemporary printing of 1775, cited as the authority in the footnote, is known; the manuscript copy in Freneau’s hand presumably represents the 1775 text which differs considerably from the later one. Again, there are two 1776 editions of The Fall of British Tyranny (the title page is not undated as the note implies) which show a number of differences in the text. It so happens that one of these occurs in a passage quoted (p. 107), where in one edition the speech ends: “and Brazen their driver,” as printed by Mr. Granger, and in the other edition goes on: “as unfit to guide the chariot of state as Phaeton was to guide the chariot of the sun.” Use of the originals would have produced a citation more accurate than that given by a former editor who had not discovered the existence of two editions.

These very minor points, which a full reworking of the texts might increase, in no substantive way make less competent the literary study the author undertook. They do, however, point up one of the weaknesses of methodology in much historical research: the feeling that original sources (hence rare books and manuscripts) are not important if they have ap-

Dean Levy presents a revisionist interpretation of the origins and original understanding of the First Amendment clause on freedom of speech and press. In six chapters, the role of seditious libel versus freedom of expression, the American colonial experience, English theory from Milton to "Cato," developments from the Zenger case to the Revolution, the period before the First Amendment, and finally the emergence of an American libertarian theory are discussed. The author contends that very few people have properly understood the famous phrases about liberty associated with our English and American forefathers. Milton wrote winged words, but himself acted as censor and licensor. The generation which adopted the Constitution and the Bill of Rights accepted the terms traditional in England and explained in Blackstone's Commentaries as recently as the 1760's. The opinion expressed by contemporary as well as more recent authors that the alien and sedition laws of 1798 were unconstitutional is absolutely contradicted by Legacy of Suppression. Freedom was thought of as consisting of the absence of a licensing system or "prior restraint," of a privilege in parliament or assembly to discuss public affairs, but not as an immunity for subjects and citizens from prosecution for licentious or seditious libels.

There are some wholesome reminders in this volume. Mr. Levy properly emphasizes the fact that early demands for freedom of expression sprang largely from quarrels between rulers and parliaments, and from the desire of nonconformists to worship as they pleased. He correctly supposes that members of colonial assemblies disliked being criticized as much if not as often as their English parliamentary cousins. Significant reservations were present in the minds of many fighters for freedom. Only an occasional expression of anything like a modern doctrine may be found in such men as Matthew Tindal and "Cato." Andrew Hamilton advanced the cause in his famous defense of Zenger; Madison envisioned liberty even for wrong-headed beliefs and controversial statements, but did not make his meaning clear. Mr. Levy has cast a wide net on both sides of the Atlantic and has examined the catch with legal precision. Earlier interpretations of popular phrases are recalled. Cases and authors are abundantly cited. Perhaps the only author of consequence with publications both in England and in
America not utilized is Dr. Joseph Priestley who deserves some credit for his extensive view of freedom and his long fight against suppression.

It may be doubted whether Mr. Levy's very sparsely awarded commendations of some are always deserved, and he occasionally does injustice to others. Fielding, for example, was, it is true, writing on the ministerial side in the passage quoted (p. 140), but he was not working for the Tories, simply for another variety of Whig, and his remarks seem too moderate from a government defender to rate censure. Other passages would show him as at least as libertarian as "Cato." John Trenchard and Thomas (not William, as in index and text) Gordon wrote the popular Cato's Letters only a few months after their equally successful Independent Whig. Both series were determined attacks on government policy in church and state, and both men, the law being as Mr. Levy describes it, wished to justify their diatribes. But it may be noted that their eloquent pleas for liberty of conscience and equality of civil rights apply only to Protestant subjects of King George. They were tolerant, but still within the framework of what the early eighteenth century found possible. And they demanded freedom of expression within the same limits. Tindal, a member of the old Grecian at which Trenchard had held forth against standing armies, was another oppositionist. What it amounts to is that those out of office and without recourse to courts were more likely to demand liberty than those defending an administration. Robert Molesworth, another man connected with the Club and credited by his children at least with a share in Cato's Letters, remarked that resistance when successful was a revolution, when it failed a rebellion. Hardly any government head but Cromwell and Frederick the Great expressed the scorn of complete indifference to what was said or written about them. But a good many persons on occasion spoke in large terms of freedom.

To some extent this is all true. Ideas of freedom change as governments change. Our forefathers would be horrified to be as regulated as to school, medical habits, and tax returns, to name no more, as we are. That our newspapers and orators may, within much wider limits, say what they like about everyone from the president down is a kind of liberty that these same ancestors would probably have dubbed license, meaning by this irresponsible and dangerous propaganda. Such irresponsible and subversive activity is today guarded against, how effectively may be doubted, of course, by oaths and protestations demanded of students, foreign visitors, and immigrants, officials and state employees—autres tems, autres meurs! There are ways in which the modern Leviathan state escapes the control of even the much more liberally interpreted "people," its sovereign, than the royal province or kingdoms of the first English empire.

What the book fails to provide is a sense of development and a sense of the importance of misinterpretation or, if preferred, reinterpretation of the beliefs of one age by another. Magna Charta was a feudal document whose authors probably never conceived of its importance to supporters of popular
government. We must not only study it in its context in the days of King John, but surely must look leniently on its misinterpretations by Coke and the Founding Fathers, since from their readings developed useful constitutional safeguards and practices. Each generation must make its own discoveries and is fortunate when it finds in ancestral achievements or pronouncements something to inspire its own. Men need continuity and frequently secure it by distortion. The legacy of men whose lives and thoughts have so disappointed Mr. Levy has not in the long run meant suppression but extension of human freedom.

_Bryn Mawr College_  
_Caroline Robbins_

**History as Romantic Art: Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman.** By **David Levin.** (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1959. xii, 260 p. Index. $5.50.)

David Levin, Associate Professor of English at Stanford University, has written a brilliant book combining literary and intellectual history and literary criticism in a study of the romantic art of writing history. Mr. Levin has not only read the published writings of our four great literary historians, some fifty volumes, but he has also probed their correspondence, notebooks, and journals to bring us an analysis that has depth and insight. He has demonstrated that those who thought of history as a romantic art wrote by certain formulas, or patterns of thought and literary techniques, that are exhibited in such masterpieces as Prescott's _Mexico_, Motley's _Rise of the Dutch Republic_, and Parkman's _Montcalm and Wolfe_. These formulas were also used by George Bancroft in writing his memorable _History of the United States_.

By means of evidence, selected from correspondence of the historians and from the histories they wrote, Mr. Levin develops his theme. The four historians wove a moral thread into the dramatic design of their narratives, the “idea of progress,” portrayed in a pattern of growing religious, civil, and intellectual freedom. Germanic, Anglo-Saxon institutions, buttressed by a Protestant tradition, were symbols of progress contrasted by Spanish and French spiritual and political despotisms as symbols of decay and retrogression.

Leading figures of the narratives, such as Bancroft’s Washington, Motley’s William the Silent, Prescott’s Isabella, and Parkman’s William Pitt, were molded in a heroic manner to display the national characteristics of the people they led. The heroes and heroines were thus mirrors of their age, representative “types” of their society. The image of Catholicism in this formula of writing, Mr. Levin maintains, was distorted at times by the romantic historians, especially in colorful descriptions of evil deeds justified in the name of religion.
Probably Mr. Levin's most valuable contribution for the historian is his analysis of dramatic structure and style showing the indebtedness of the romantic historians to literary figures like Scott and Byron. From this part of Mr. Levin's book, particularly the skillful dissection of paragraphs, the professional historian who seeks to improve his writing will profit.

Of the four romantic historians Mr. Levin selects Parkman as the most impartial and the greatest literary artist. In his analysis of Parkman's *Montcalm and Wolfe*, Mr. Levin shows it to be a work that combines the best of the romantic art of writing history. It is indeed gratifying that Parkman has received this acclaim from Mr. Levin, for historians, who have pored over the original sources of his narrative and appraised his sense of historic proportion, have gradually come to appreciate his *History* as a model for narrative style and diligent research combined with historical imagination.

Those who tenaciously follow the school of "scientific history," which has long been critical of the romantic historians, may take note of Mr. Levin's book. It explains, in large part, why and how Parkman, Prescott, Motley, and Bancroft were able to write vivid narrative in which men and women were "recreated." It is possible that their techniques have been underrated. It is also possible that their view of history as a literary art, one of the most difficult forms of literary expression, may now be accepted as a method of revealing the truth of history. We know that Parkman strove to keep his dramatic design of writing in bounds of what he called "just historic proportion," for he wanted, he said, "to tell things as they really happened."

*Their Brothers' Keepers. Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800-1865.*


Some years ago Professor Alice Felt Tyler, in *Freedom's Ferment*, drew attention to the stimulating influence of earlier nineteenth-century American voluntary reform movements on political activity and interest of the day. Now Professor Griffin gives us an interesting study of the same period which makes an important contribution to the understanding of the relationship between moral suasion and political action by analyzing the idea of moral stewardship and appraising those who espoused it in the Protestant religious community of the United States.

The stewards, generally more affluent laymen and their clerical associates, heirs of colonial Calvinism, conscious of a divine commission, gave of themselves and their substance in an effort to build an America on the basis of their reading of the divine plans. Never a dominant force, their voluntary
efforts in the interest of moral reform proved disappointing. What seemed
to promise fulfillment of their hopes was political action, fully in keeping
with the theocratic tradition, though earlier eschewed, and as an instrument
of reform the stewards adopted the new Republican Party. Its political
success and the war to preserve the Union became the occasion and the
means for a crusade to recover America, especially the South, for God.

Of interest today is Professor Griffin’s conclusion that following the Civil
War “morality by persuasion and morality by compulsion were permanent
characteristics of American life.” The stewards are no longer so readily
identified, but their belief that those seeking political support must be of
their number or at least meet with their approval still survives in some
quarters.

Apart from the theme of this book there is not a great deal that is new.
There are excellent studies for virtually all the reforms, and the political
saga has been told and retold. The story of the stewards could have been
more complete with some consideration of one of the reform movements of
the 1850’s, the Young Men’s Christian Association, a special project of the
urban stewards. When the Y.M.C.A. assumed sponsorship of the religious
revival in the winter of 1857–1858, the stewards sought to emphasize moral
reform to the exclusion of political action, which was by that time disrupting
the evangelical churches, the reform societies, and threatening the nation
itself.

*Rutgers University*  


The purpose of the series to which this volume is a recent addition is
evidently to present for general consumption certain important and inter-
esting episodes in our national development. Carleton Beals, best known for
his writings in the Latin American field, has developed an account of the
several waves of nativism in America through the 1830’s and the 1840’s to
the grand climax in the Know-Nothing movement of the 1850’s. His
emphasis is on these decades, although there is some treatment of post-
Civil War nativism. The reader thus is treated to a review of familiar
material—Rebecca Reed, Maria Monk, Samuel F. B. Morse, Bishop
Hughes, and others again have their brief moment in the center of the stage.
The ground covered is to a considerable extent identical with that found in
Billington’s Protestant Crusade and to some extent in Higham’s Strangers in
the Land. (This latter volume is not listed in the bibliography.)

This volume, however, cannot be reviewed in the same manner as these
other two. It is apparently not a work of original scholarship—not a “con-
tribution to knowledge." There is little documentation, although an "Abridged Bibliography" lists most of the basic titles on the nativism of the years 1820-1860. Neither newspapers nor manuscripts have apparently been used in preparing the volume, although there is mention in the bibliography of the valuable material available in personal memoirs.

All this is to say, then, that this is an attempt at writing "popular" history. The question for the reviewer thus becomes: How well has the attempted popularization of material familiar to most American historians been done? The answer is neither black nor white. The volume has several good points. Beals, quite properly, places nineteenth-century nativism against the broad background of change, growth, adjustment, and violence which was the nineteenth century. He tries throughout to relate nativism and its manifestation in the Know-Nothing movement to deep social and psychological currents—currents, he suggests, still operative today. Although the treatment of the years after the Civil War is sketchy, he seeks to link the present with our not-too-distant past by examining "one of those emotional and mental fevers that periodically overtake the American democracy." In doing this, he has many such perceptive statements. Another, for example, occurs when he labels the anti-Catholic literature of the 1830's an "early version of today's cheap paperback torture, sadism, violence, and sex."

But the volume has, to this reviewer, several serious shortcomings. One is an occasional tendency to oversimplify. Another is a repetitiousness and an unevenness in treating the many facets of the subject. Some topics are developed at considerable length, while others of the same general type are given but cursory treatment. Beals's journalistic style has enabled him to capture much of the spirit and excitement of nineteenth-century nativism, but the story itself is inherently exciting and dramatic and is quite fascinating without journalistic embellishment. At times, the volume seems a strained effort to exploit the sensational.

In his venture into the subject of nineteenth-century nativism Beals has written with enthusiasm and spirit, but more careful organization and a greater tentativeness in making conclusions would have improved the volume. While it will be of little use to professional historians (except for the many morsels with which to enliven their lectures), it may serve to lead the general reader to other studies in the highly significant field which it treats.

Muhlenberg College  

JOHN J. REED

Grant Moves South. By BRUCE CATTON. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1960. Maps, bibliography, index. $6.50.)

This account of Grant's career takes him from June, 1861, to the fall of Vicksburg in July, 1863. In that interval, Grant evolved from an unknown and untried regimental commander to the most successful general the
North had produced. Between those dates was action at Belmont, Forts Henry and Donelson, Shiloh, and the Vicksburg campaign. The account is full and complete and shows how Grant grew in military stature and why he succeeded. Tact and firmness in handling unruly enlisted personnel and subordinate commanders enabled him to convert an armed mob into a disciplined army. Success came because he never repeated the same error twice; because of the support of able subordinates of his own choosing, especially Sherman and McPherson; because of a growing strategic and tactical understanding; because of a usual superiority in men and munitions; and because he was unwilling to acknowledge defeat.

Grant was not successful at Belmont, but he learned, and he gained “the trust and allegiance” of his men; he barely held the field at Fort Donelson; and there is no question but that he was surprised on the first day at Shiloh. Perhaps, only the providential death of the Confederate leader, General Albert Sidney Johnston, at the close of the first day’s fighting saved him from defeat. He had learned many valuable lessons, however, not the least of which was that “in every battle may come a moment when each side is fought out and ready to quit.” At that moment, victory goes to the leader who attacks. Grant employed this axiom at Shiloh and at Vicksburg with success.

The author writes of Grant with admiration, and says of him that after Shiloh he developed into “a military realist.” Although author Catton states that “there would always be a faint cloud” between Grant and Halleck, he felt that, on balance, “Halleck in the end would do Grant more good than harm,” although Grant, in later years, was not so fair. General C. F. Smith, Grant’s loyal second in command, receives more recognition than is usual. His untimely death deprived the North of the services and leadership of a gallant and capable soldier. Sherman later wrote that “Had C. F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Fort Donelson.” Maybe!

The author discounts the stories of Grant’s addiction to strong drink and defends his treatment of McClernand with whom he had his greatest difficulties. General John A. McClernand, a political general of some ability with influential friends in Washington, was bent on ousting Grant and taking over the command himself. Fortunately, Grant ranked him. Finally, in the spring of 1863, while Grant’s army was struggling in its efforts to get at Vicksburg, Grant bluntly put McClernand in his place and was supported by the Washington authorities. McClernand’s injudicious order of congratulation to his command, which got into the newspapers, infuriated Sherman and McPherson and provided Grant with a clear opportunity to relieve McClernand of his command and to order him “to any point he may select in the state of Illinois.” The volatile McClernand had ability, but was self-seeking. He needs an objective, capable biographer.

An interesting feature of this book is that while adequate in its treatment of Grant as a general, it also discusses Grant’s problems as an administrator.
of occupied territory, a territory that generated "problems of incredible intensity for whose solution nothing in his training afforded any guidance." These problems related primarily to contraband trade, refugee slaves, supplies and the detailed minutiae of life in camp and on the march in conquered or enemy territory.

Grant Moves South is an able follow-up to the late Lloyd Lewis' initial volume. It is based on extensive and careful research. The story is told with color and drama. Grant comes alive as a man and a soldier. His evolution as a soldier and a leader is traced in an interesting and effective manner. The book is provided with a full bibliography and a good index.

Locust Valley, N. Y. Thomas Robson Hay


Gideon Welles was a careful man of decided views who kept elaborate records and used them effectively to back up his opinions. He became Secretary of the Navy by Lincoln's appointment in 1861 and held that post for eight years during the entire Civil War and the first third of Reconstruction. He had been in the habit of keeping diaries for many years and when he came to Washington the passion did not leave him. At first, his record was something of a fragmentary and occasional exercise, but in the summer of 1862 he began an elaborate daily record which enabled him to keep account of his acts, his thoughts, and his analysis of people and events. He returned to his home in Hartford in 1869, taking his voluminous record with him. It was about this time that the stream of books and articles dealing with the Civil War began to increase in volume. Welles had noted that they frequently contained errors, but not until his retirement did he have time to deal with them. Almost immediately he began to write. Referring to his great diary, his files, and his very firm views of truth, he compiled a series of articles designed to set the record straight.

Sixteen of these which appeared in the Galaxy and two published in the Atlantic Monthly, 1871-1878, are here collected by Albert Mordell and published with prefaces by the compiler and by Hans Louis Trefouse. At the time of their publication, they revealed a good deal of war history then unknown. So convincing and so well documented was Welles's writing that most of it is now the accepted canon of the history of that period.
These articles cover episodes from April, 1861, to the early days of Reconstruction. Welles was a great admirer of Lincoln, he did not trust Seward, he had to try hard but he could be fair to Stanton. He felt that the protagonists of the army and certain of its generals ignored the achievements of the navy. He was certain that there was a conspiracy of the Radicals or “centralists” to destroy the rights of the states and the Constitution, and to create an oligarchic form of national control. He was earnest to give Admiral Farragut his due, for he felt that the naval hero had been badly treated.

The essays are presented in most convenient form in the order in which they were published. They themselves are interesting not only for the contribution which they make to truth in history, but also for the picture they give of Welles, one of the most interesting of the Civil War figures. Mr. Mordell deserves our gratitude for bringing these pieces together and making them so readily available at this centennial time. They deserve wide reading.

University of Pennsylvania

ROY F. NICHOLS

The Good Years: From 1900 to the First World War. By WALTER LORD. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. xii, 369 p. Illustrations, bibliographical note, index. $4.95.)

Walter Lord has already demonstrated, in A Night to Remember and Day of Infamy, his ability to write history that appeals to a wide popular audience. Lord’s formula, repeated in his latest book, is to choose a fascinating story and to tell it in a fast-paced, you-are-there style, reminiscent of the large-circulation news magazines. His work may not be altogether satisfactory to professional historians, or to other discriminating readers, but it is highly enjoyable and often exciting reading.

This book is more ambitious than the author’s previous efforts, each of which was based upon a single, dramatic event: one, the sinking of the Titanic, the other, the bombing of Pearl Harbor. This time, Lord has endeavored to impart the flavor of an era, the period between 1900 and World War I. His theme is that these were the “good years,” not because they were prosperous—millions were sunk in the depths of poverty; not because they were peaceful—the imperialists often had their way by means of violence. “These years were good,” according to Lord, “because whatever the trouble, people were sure they could fix it.” Men then saw themselves as “heroes shaping the world, rather than victims struggling through it.”

To support this thesis, Lord relies upon a series of exciting tales—the siege of the “foreign devils” in Peking, the assassination of President
McKinley, the bank panic of 1907, a parade of suffragettes on Fifth Avenue, the San Francisco earthquake, the murder trial of union leader Big Bill Haywood—sixteen in all. His chapters are filled with scenes that bring the reader into the story, and which stay in the memory long after the book has been finally closed. A Methodist minister rushes from place to place, night and day, directing the defense of the foreign compound in Peking against Boxer fanatics. A reflective doctor watches the gentle McKinley during his fatal illness and decides that, after all, a man can be a good Christian and a good politician. We see “Teddy” Roosevelt, full of gusto, sending the fleet around the world, hunting bear, and ignoring reports of a developing financial panic. We see the great Morgan, striding purposefully down Nassau Street, on his way, everyone hopes, to end the panic.

A good deal of Lord’s most interesting material came from dozens of personal interviews he conducted with witnesses to the events he describes. He has also made heavy use of newspapers throughout the country; but he has paid surprisingly little attention to the enormous number of manuscript collections for the period, although these usually provide more accurate information than the recollections, fifty years later, of eyewitnesses. For his major interpretations, Lord relies chiefly upon the standard secondary sources, and, generally speaking, he has chosen wisely among them. The author has an aversion to footnotes; there are none in the book, but he does include a brief bibliography for each chapter.

Lord’s work suffers from two important defects, one traceable to his choice of material, the other to his technique. He concentrates upon a fairly narrow segment of our society, only slightly more representative of the country than were the passengers on the ill-fated Titanic. There are facts and figures in the book about less pleasant aspects of American life—about the millions of working children who were paid as little as forty cents a day, about the majority of workers who earned less than what was generally considered a subsistence wage—but the chapters on these subjects deal chiefly with the efforts of relatively well-to-do reformers. Farmers, Negroes, and the immigrants who crowded our cities are hardly mentioned. Lord observes that a Chicago ordinance, passed in 1910, prohibited men and women from bathing together on public beaches, but he provides only an inkling of the freedom we have won from “Victorian” restrictions. If the author had presented a fuller picture of our society, it would have been clear that in correcting the flaws in the “good years” we, as a people, have gained much more than we have lost.

The book suffers also from its primary asset. Lord’s technique does not lend itself to penetrating analysis, which would hold up the fast-moving story. This is a book written much more to entertain than to edify. It achieves its primary purpose admirably, without sacrificing accuracy; but much more can be said about American society during the “good years.”

New York

Stanley Coben

Any study of Gifford Pinchot obviously has special interest for Pennsylvanians because of his two terms as governor and several other bids for public office in this state, not to mention his wife's Congressional aspirations (surely that energetic lady, recently deceased, is herself worth a full-length biography). It is therefore appropriate that a professor at the state university has immersed himself in the voluminous Pinchot papers at the Library of Congress so as to produce a detailed account of this colorful political leader. But his book acquires a wider significance for all students of American history because of the contributions it also necessarily makes to our knowledge both of the conservation movement in the United States and of the Theodore Roosevelt brand of Progressivism. Hence, Mr. McGearry's full-scale study is indeed welcome for meeting a long felt need in a way which will not have to be repeated for a long time to come.

His story falls into three stages along the lines just indicated. The narrative of Pinchot's forestry work and many other conservation activities is told as clearly as can be expected of any topic inherently so technical and complicated, though even so it may seem at times a little tedious to those who are not special students of the field. The climax of this aspect of Pinchot's career comes with a careful examination of his celebrated feud with Secretary of the Interior Ballinger. Here Mr. McGearry, though far from uncritical, is somewhat more favorable to Pinchot and Glavis than has been characteristic of the revisionism of recent years. One wonders, however, whether this may be because the story is told so largely on the basis of material in the Pinchot papers. If it had been told with equal reference to the manuscripts of Pinchot's opponents, would the conclusions have been the same?

The second part of the book is the story of Pinchot's close association with Theodore Roosevelt, particularly during the period of the ill-fated Progressive Party. By its very nature this section is far more dramatic than the part on conservation, though perhaps it also covers more familiar ground. But this reviewer at least had not known that Pinchot was essentially the author of T.R.'s famous New Nationalism speech at Osawatomie, and others may find particularly valuable the detailed account of Pinchot's dropping his support of LaFollette's candidacy in 1912 and his turning to Roosevelt in a way which seems far from creditable to the presumably highly idealistic reformer.

Far less well-known, yet especially interesting to residents of this state, is the full treatment of Pinchot's two gubernatorial administrations. Though conceding that many roadblocks handicapped the crusading executive, quite clearly Mr. McGearry thinks that these years rank almost as high among Pinchot's constructive achievements as do his conservation activi-
ties. Even so, the author suggests that there is considerable irony in the fact that the great liberal could win elections only when he had the de facto support of the Grundy machine. He also makes clear that Pinchot was a progressive who never had unqualified labor support or even urban following, but instead drew more heavily from the state’s rural areas which were attracted by his backing of prohibition and good roads.

As a person, Pinchot belongs to that group of liberal aristocrats (in the peculiar American sense of that term) of whom the two Roosevelts were such striking examples. Interestingly, Pinchot came to admire F.D.R. as well as T.R., much more than did many other former Bull Moosers. But Mr. McGeary also shows that Pinchot was far less attractive a person than either of the Roosevelts, which may go far to explain why they both became President, whereas Pinchot never achieved what was obviously his strong ambition. He was too often a self-righteous and irritating person, who repeatedly found it difficult to get along with others, even if (or perhaps because) they were liberals also. He also seems to have had a startling capacity for political self-delusion that made his judgment far from sound. Mr. McGeary does the best he can to put Pinchot’s best foot forward, but clearly even he does not always find his subject entirely to his taste.

For all the book’s thoroughness and excellent evaluations, it cannot be said to make exciting reading. Unfortunately, Mr. McGeary does not have either a lively or felicitous style (reference to someone as “Reverend Gill,” for example, made this reviewer wince). But this does not detract substantially from the value of the book, since it both gives a fully documented account of an important career and shows remarkable skill in threading a balanced way through some highly controversial problems.

University of Pennsylvania

WALLACE EVAN DAVIES


Mr. Schack begins the foreword to his life of the eccentric Dr. Barnes of Merion by saying frankly that this is not an “authorized” biography. This statement encourages the reader to hope that the work is to be no mere whitewashing of a controversial character, but at the same time it tells him that, since the author did not know the doctor personally, there will be few intimate glimpses into the life of the man who locked the gates of the Barnes Foundation to the general public and from behind the walls of his fortress shot darts of venomous obloquy at the rest of the art world. But Mr. Schack has talked to a host of people who knew and liked Barnes or who suffered from his attacks, and has unearthed many interesting facts about him.
Barnes's early life and education have been checked against his later accounts of them, and the discrepancies noted, but these are not hard to reconcile if one allows for the exaggerations of a romantic nature. The studies at Heidelberg and the discovery of Argyrol, the reasons why it was not patented and the early days of its manufacture are also disinterred from a mass of inaccurate later accounts, such as, for example, that his partner committed suicide, or that Barnes stole the formula from him or from someone else. Barnes as a young married man and a member of the Rose Tree Hunt comes as something of a surprise, but this incursion into Philadelphia society did not last long. His arrogance was such that he could not have relations for long with anyone on a basis of equality, and he found congenial friends first among the employees of his chemical manufactory and later among the students at the Foundation. Others who remained his friends had to be willing to put up with his arrogance, which they probably did because they found him intellectually stimulating or amusing for his vitality.

Having amassed a fortune in a short time, Barnes began to buy pictures. Though he had bought before 1912, it was in that year that he gave the painter Glackens $20,000 to go to Paris and "buy what he liked." (Barnes angrily denied that Glackens had ever bought pictures for him when Sturgis Ingersoll repeated this story in 1937.) The pictures were first hung in Barnes's house, then some were hung in the factory to inspire the workers. But it was not until 1924 when Barnes was fifty-two that the Foundation in Merion opened its doors: opened them, says Schack, "only half way." At first, this caution seems to have been due to the hostile attitude of the public to an exhibition of his pictures held the year before at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. Characteristically, Dr. Barnes included the Academy (which had lent him their galleries) in his hatred of the general public.

Barnes's book, *The Art in Painting*, whether he wrote all of it or not, shows his strange desire to reduce the appreciation of painting to a science. His analysis of what makes a painting good is interesting, and he tries to base appreciation firmly on these considerations, but he was finally forced to admit that there is some quality that eludes analysis, which makes a painting a work of art. His precepts and his pictures met with general acceptance in the years that followed those early days, but only the agreement of his students seems to have pleased Barnes. When others disagreed, he berated them; when they agreed, he cried "plagiarism." This jealousy, the desire that he be recognized as the only fountain of truth, seems to have underlain his quarrels with the Philadelphia Museum, the University of Pennsylvania, the Philadelphia Board of Education, the *Saturday Evening Post*, Lord Russell, and others too numerous to mention. In telling of these quarrels the author remains strictly neutral, marshaling the evidence and giving an impartial account of each side. But in the long run, the reader wants to turn to him and ask, "But what do you think?" When no answer is forthcoming, he is likely to grow impatient.
Letters from Barnes are freely quoted (we must assume without the permission of the Foundation), but they make, on the whole, tiresome reading. The joking letters written in French and purporting to come from his bitch Fidèle, the constant references to the Art Museum as "the house of artistic prostitution," with other insulting or obscene remarks, the "humor" (which is always bad-humored)—all become wearisome.

In spite of this honest attempt to explain him, Barnes still remains a mystery.
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George Roberts

_The Worlds of Chippy Patterson._ By Arthur H. Lewis. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1960. [vi], 311 p. $5.00.)

Thirty years ago, a tall, slender, shabbily-dressed man wearing a dirty cloth cap was seen almost daily slouching along the corridors of Philadelphia’s City Hall. He was C. Stuart Patterson, Jr., youngest son of wealthy, cultured, and highly respected parents whom he seemed determined to make unhappy by conduct that repeatedly embarrassed them. As a successful criminal lawyer, he represented thousands of men and women of the underworld, often without compensation, and with them he made his life.

He was a rebel: to some a hero, to others a roustabout who had a way with juries. In any case, he had individuality, something to be cherished when it has become so rare. It might be wondered why he has not had his biographer before this. Perhaps because we are soft and indulgent and have submitted to immersion in a sea of sex and sensationalism, we are now ready and eager for the story of this unusual man. From a search of court records and newspaper files and from interviews with friends of Chippy, Mr. Lewis has produced an absorbing book.

Chippy was spoiled by his family and neglected by a father dedicated to the active professional life of a corporation lawyer. At fifteen he took to drink. Somehow he finished his formal education and got through the law school where his father and older brother had distinguished connections. Upon admission to the bar he went off on a binge, remaining absent, whereabouts unknown, for eight months until rescued from a park bench in Washington. He spent nearly three years in a sanitarium. On his release at thirty-two, he gave up liquor forever. He also abjured any professional connection with civil practice and drifted into criminal law where he found his second, his great, world.

He abandoned the comforts and amenities of patrician life in Chestnut Hill while maintaining a slight connection with some friends of his youth. His regular associates were the faithful few who believed in and worked with him. Without law books and frequently without an office, except a telephone booth at a railway station, he became one of the most successful criminal lawyers in the city.
His acuteness, agility, sense of humor and pleasing smile impressed both judge and jury and, in turn, pardon and parole boards. In a wide variety of cases he won verdicts of acquittal, or wangled less than expected sentences for those found guilty. All concerned, in particular the criminals themselves, were pleased to bathe in the aura of Patterson social and professional respectability.

While Chippy established a remarkable record in homicide trials which this book in no sense minimizes, it is very doubtful that he could have tried as many as 125,000 cases in his thirty years of practice as the author suggests. To do so, eliminating Sundays, and regular and summer holidays when the courts do not sit, Chippy would have had to try more than twenty cases every working day for thirty years. Nor is it likely that on any one day, let alone a morning, he could have effectively represented as many as twenty-five defendants in the court of even the most complacent magistrate.

The world of the professional criminal, the “con” man, prostitute, burglar, dope peddler, and murderer, the world of the tenderloin, with its saloons, speakeasies, flophouses, and opium dens, became Chippy’s habitat when not at City Hall. On its fringes he lived with a considerable assortment of women, the idol of the ne’er-do-well, the vicious, and the outlaw. His one marriage took him temporarily out of that world, but it soon foundered.

To the extent that he bestows a knightly character on his subject the author provides a picture differing from that remembered over past decades by many lawyers who, in Chippy’s day, knew their way around City Hall. Unquestionably, by this man’s efforts hundreds of criminals were prematurely turned loose to prey upon society and continued to do so. Their release by juries or pardon board was procured not without some lack of respect for courtroom decorum and approved trial practices. Somehow, nevertheless, this bizarre man endeared himself to many. He was preposterously generous to the down-and-outers and to the women who sponged on him. When he collected substantial fees, he frequently failed to pay his rent and his often neglected assistants. He had a warm heart for those to whom he was a hero. But above and beyond all, he was persistent and effective in heaping anguish and insult upon his family in return for their affection and in bringing humiliation and heartache to those of his own flesh and blood.
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HAROLD D. SAYLOR


In this latest volume of the New American Nation Series, edited by Henry Steele Commager and Richard B. Morris, Professor Hicks has
written a concise review of the dozen years under Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

The book is preponderantly an indictment of the average American and his leaders in the 1920's. A sentence or two toward the end of the volume summarizes as well as anything the general attitude of the author: "But one of the most characteristic failures of the times was the inability of most Americans, either leaders or led, to think clearly about anything. . . . Truly these were days in which the blind led the blind."

It is no surprise that Harding, "whose unfitness for the Presidency could hardly have been more obvious," receives no acclaim whatever. His genius, according to Hicks, "lay not so much in his ability to conceal his thought as in the absence of any serious thought to reveal."

Coolidge fares little better: "Coolidge's career in politics was a shining example of what inertia could do for a man of patience." But the author does concede that Coolidge was probably right in objecting to the McNary-Haugen agricultural bill on economic grounds.

Hicks's recurring theme is the domination of the Republican Party during this period by a single interest—business and industry. Whereas the leaders of business under Harding and Coolidge had men in the White House who would do their bidding, Hicks maintains that in Hoover they obtained a businessman as President who "would instinctively reflect their every prejudice." The author shows more respect for Hoover, however, than for the other two; he refers to Hoover, for example, as a "skilled administrator," and points out that he "made the nation's economic plight his concern to a degree that previous depression Presidents had never deemed necessary or feasible."

Hicks is convinced that business while in the saddle acted stupidly (he does not use this exact word). In its attitude on the tariff, "The business interest stood convicted of not even knowing what was good for business itself." One of its great mistakes was its "stubbm refusal . . . to countenance any really effective measures for the relief of agriculture." It was "business leadership," concludes Hicks, that "led straight to the Panic of 1929, then on deeper and deeper into the worst depression the western world had ever known in modern times."

In taking a highly critical position toward the Republicans in their ascendancy, the author does not suggest that at this time the Democrats had all the right answers. And he finds "shortcomings" in the platform of the La Follette Progressives in the campaign of 1924.

Even the reader who feels that Professor Hicks has been overharsh in his evaluation of the 1920's will be well advised to read this fascinating account of disarmament, movies, prohibition, isolation, the causes of the depression, radio, H. L. Mencken, the impact of automobiles, etc., during the "age of disillusionment."

Pennsylvania State University  M. Nelson McGearry
Proposed Publication

Charles R. Barker’s manuscript, “A Register of Burying Grounds of Philadelphia, Pa.,” is not only an important historical contribution, but, as all who have used it are aware, an invaluable aid in genealogical research.

It is not a register of burials, but a record of the history and location of denominational, public, and private family cemeteries in the Philadelphia area. Assembled in 1942 and 1943, Mr. Barker based his information on deeds, archives, ordinances, laws, Board of Health records and newspaper accounts. He has collected data describing where and when bodies were removed; whether inscriptions were ever transcribed; and has included historical notes and, wherever available, views and maps relating to the various cemeteries.

A general introduction is devoted to the history of the “rise and fall” of Philadelphia cemeteries; in the old city at least sixty have been established through the years; today there are twenty-six in the central city. An appendix recites pertinent deeds dating from 1819 to 1906, and there is a lucid explanation which delineates the general alphabetical arrangement, including all variant names for the cemeteries cited.

If sufficient interest is evinced by individuals and organizations in having this record of about 572 pages for their libraries, the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania will undertake photo-offset publication of Mr. Barker’s manuscript, which is written in a clear, legible hand. Until the extent of interest is known, a price cannot be set. Orders should be addressed to the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania, 1300 Locust Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.
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